THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

THIRD SERIES—VOL. IX.—(XXIX).—NOVEMBER, 1903.—NO. 5

THE TWOFOLD ASPECT OF PURGATORY.

PURGATORY has, broadly speaking, two aspects. It may be considered as a state either of expiatory punishment or of purificatory cleansing. In whichever light we regard it, the reasonableness of the Church's teaching will be apparent the more carefully the subject is studied.

I.—PURGATORY AS EXPIATORY.

In the first place, Purgatory is a prison to which sinners are consigned by the Judge, into which they are cast by that stern, inexorable officer, Death—a prison, says Jesus Christ, whence there is no escape until our debt of justice has been paid to the uttermost farthing. "Verily, I say to thee, thou shalt not go out thence until thou payest the very last mite." (St. Luke 12: 59.)

God is this Judge who exacts the full penalty for our transgressions. He is not only the loving Father willing not the death of a sinner, but He is also just and righteous, demanding a retribution according to the measure of the offence. As he is essentially holy, so He can admit nothing that is contrary to the eternal law of justice. He is not like man, to be swayed by sentiment at the expense of what is right—a mere benevolent philanthropist, an "enlarged Lord Shaftesbury," to use Matthew Arnold's apt though flippant phrase—one ready to let the evil-doer off scot-free.

A judge on earth who allowed a prisoner convicted beyond doubt of theft, violence, or murder, or a debtor who had robbed

his creditors, to go out of the dock a free man, would sin doubly: against society, whose laws have been wantonly outraged, and against the principles of right-dealing with our neighbor, on which civilization is based. And God, who has implanted in men's minds the knowledge of those laws and principles of justice, shows in Himself, in His relations to His creatures, the same maintenance of an inviolable standard. If, using mercy alone, He were to exact no satisfaction for His honor set at naught by the sinner's rebellion, His sanctity would be plainly at fault.

For to remit what is due as just expiation for iniquity is nothing else but to forgive unrighteously the wrong-doer, and to make God, the unjust pardoner of unpunished sin, no longer holy. Moreover, since in this case the same treatment would be meted out to sinful and sinless, there would be manifest injustice and lawlessness, in that the sanction of right conduct would cease, the transgressor would be in exactly the same position as the faithful observer of the Commandments, and sin unpunished, unatoned, would fall under no law.[1]

It is therefore inconsistent with the Divine Nature, undimmed by any shadow of evil, that God should forgive anything in His realm of creation illegally, or, in other words, forgive *unpunished sin.* The Judge, by virtue of His own infinite sanctity—the fount of all justice and righteousness—must condemn the debtor to pay his debt, if not in this life, then in the life to come, and, in the latter case, deliver the prisoner to the officer who consigns him, in spite of his appeals, his struggles, and his tears, "bound hand and foot," into the prison of "exterior darkness." What is this debt that has to be paid to the last mite? The Council of Trent,[2] in conformity with Holy Scripture, teaches us that sin has a double issue: it stamps the soul with the ugly mark of separation from an All-holy, All-lovable God, and (as an act of supreme rebellion against the Creator) it entails the strict requirement of a satisfaction in proportion to the gravity of the offence.

This twofold effect of sin—its stain of guilt, its penalty of pain—was effaced by the Sacrifice of Calvary. Jesus Christ, the one Mediator between God and man, uniting in a single Person-

[1] *Cf.* St. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo?* cap. xii.

[2] Session VI, cap. 14; can. 30.

ality the two natures (the human and the divine), could alone offer in the sinner's stead a satisfaction commensurate with the offence—an infinite satisfaction for an infinite offence. Sin was wholly destroyed on the Cross, its stain effaced, its debt cancelled, when He presented Himself to the Eternal Father "through the veil, that is to say, His Flesh," and made an oblation of His spotless life.

But how was this priceless offering to obtain its fruit? How were the merits of Calvary to be *applied individually* to the souls of men? In two ways: through the channels of sacramental grace, and through the treasury of satisfactions, either stored up in the Church as the legacies of saints, confessors, and martyrs, of Mary their Queen,[3] and of Christ their Eternal King, who is the Priest and Victim of every Sacrifice of the Mass, or performed by the labors of members of the Body of the Redeemer. The guilt of original sin (and of actual sin in the case of adults) is washed away by the waters of Baptism; other sins are remitted through the power of the Keys in the Sacrament of Penance—that "second plank after shipwreck;"[4] the atoning Sacrifice of the Eucharist, the representation of the One all-sufficient Sacrifice of the Cross, is offered daily in propitiation for the sins of priests and people; but after the sin has been forgiven, there remains, at least in the case of post-baptismal sin (for in holy Baptism we are taught that all punishment, as well as all guilt, is effaced), not indeed the *eternal* punishment which every mortal sin entails (for that is perforce remitted at the moment when the absolving words are pronounced over the repentant sinner, or when an act of perfect contrition has been made), but the *temporal* punishment that still remains to be expiated, in order that the requirements of Divine Justice may be fulfilled.

Of this truth we are assured, not only by the voice of God's messenger on earth, the Holy Catholic Church, at the General Council of Trent,[5] but also by the testimony of the

[3] On the subject of Indulgences, see an article by the present writer in THE DOLPHIN for June, 1902.

[4] St. Jerome, *Ep. ad Demetr.* *Cf.* Tertullian, who is the first to use the expression. (*De Poem.* 1, Migne, P. L., i. col. 1233.)

[5] Session XIV, can. 12

Scriptures. Thus Adam, although he obtained forgiveness for his disobedience, did not obtain remission of the temporal consequences of his act. The gates of Eden were still closed on him; an angel with flaming sword still cut off all approach to the tree of life; he had still to wander outside in the world of thorns, briars, and sharp stones, eating his bread in the sweat of his brow, until he returned through the painful way of death to the earth whence he was taken. In other words, he had to undergo *temporal punishment*, even after his actual sin was forgiven.

Similarly, we read[6] that David, when the prophet Nathan told him in a parable of the enormity of his double sin of murder and adultery, repented and was forgiven, yet had still to undergo the penalty: his child must die. "And Nathan said to David, The Lord . . . hath taken away thy sin; thou shalt not die. Nevertheless, because thou hast given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, for this thing, the child that is born to thee shall surely die."

The practice of all antiquity bears witness to the same fact in exacting so great penances (sometimes lasting for years) from those who had fallen into grievous sin after the white-robing of their Baptism. For this severity of ecclesiastical discipline was founded on the belief that such sins involved the pain of temporal punishment, whether performed before or after absolution, by which the requirements of Divine Justice were satisfied.

In either case, both as regards the guilt and the satisfaction, we must remember that the merit is wholly due to Christ our Redeemer. It is because Protestants ignore this fundamental point of Catholic teaching that they cavil at the doctrines of Purgatory and Indulgences as though they conflicted with the mediatorial office of the Son of God. The Church is at pains to instruct her youngest child that Jesus Christ is the one source of all virtue, grace and merit; that He and He alone has paid the full penalty for our transgressions, "bearing our sins in His own Body upon the Tree"; that it is through the all-atoning merits of His Precious Blood that "the laver of regeneration" has its power, "the ministry of reconciliation" its value; and, finally, that it is solely

[6] II Kings 12: 13 ff.

because we are united by grace to Him, our living Head, as very members incorporate of His Body, that our good works, prayers, Masses, mortifications, penances, and humble submission to the Divine Will, can avail in the smallest degree in satisfaction for our debt, or that the pains of Purgatory can release us from the prison into which we are cast after death by our unexpiated sin.

The Son of God has come to redeem us from all iniquity, but His *Justice* must be satisfied even by those who have had their sins forgiven them, and that satisfaction is only possible to such as are joined by spiritual bands to the Head, Christ Jesus, from whom all merit flows. Christ is our Saviour from every sin, our Ransomer from every form of captivity. United to Him our works can bear fruit in the supernatural order; we can pay our debt down to the very last mite; we can be free and reign with God in the Kingdom of glory as redeemed children of His grace and love.

This temporal punishment, which is the lot of every sinner, however repentant, takes place, as we have said, either now or in the future life. The poor man Lazarus, full of sores, eager for the crumbs that fell from Dives' table, thankful even that the dogs should lick his festering limbs, had his Purgatory before ever the officer Death could cast him into the dark prison beyond the grave. The hungry, the outcast, the sorrowful, the sick, the suffering, the oppressed—the flotsam and jetsam of life—born, as it seems, under an unlucky star, the sport of wayward fortune; they whom men count miserable, are in reality only anticipating their time of punishment, paying off now, instead of in a future Purgatory, the debt due for their sins to the Justice of God.

A consideration of this use of poverty and misfortune will defeat the objection sometimes made against the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, that it is unfair, in so much as the poor, who cannot provide Masses to be said for their souls, are at an obvious disadvantage to the rich who can, out of their wealth, make abundant provision for their future spiritual welfare. For, if the former have their Purgatory in this world, they have plainly less need to anticipate satisfaction for their sins in the next, than the latter who, from the fact that they live in luxury now, are unable to make the conditions of their daily life into so many opportunities of merit.

Moreover, it should be noted that "the deceitfulness of riches" is a fruitful occasion of temptation and sin to their possessors, beset with cares from which the poor man is, from the nature of the case, happily free.

Most of us, however, cannot have this consolation which should make poverty and misfortune more bearable. We cannot truthfully urge in our favor that the sufferings of this life have expiated to the full every sin that we have committed. Nor can we be sure that our voluntary penances and good works have effected the same object. So long as *one* venial sin, or the temporal consequence of *one* mortal sin remains unpunished, we cannot hope to escape the pains of Purgatory. "Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt not go out thence—out of that dark prison of sharp punishment with its torture of burning fire—until thou hast paid the very last mite." These are the words of the Eternal Truth. They tell us unmistakably that there remains for all who have departed this life not rejecting God's friendship in rebellion to the very last, a certainty of ultimate expiation for the debt to the Divine Justice still left uncancelled.

And reason corroborates their message. For can we say that after death there is no alternative for innumerable souls, neither very good nor very bad, but Hell, involving eternal separation from God, the ceaseless gnawing of the undying worm and the burning of the unquenchable flame, or else the Beatific Vision of the Triune God, the All-Holy Creator, before whom pure spirits tremble and the earth and sea flee away? Surely to admit the first is uncharitable; the Church, it has been well said, has her long Calendar of Saints, but she has no register of the damned; while to hold the second is impious, since nothing defiled can enter the Heaven of perfect purity, nor can unatoned sin be allowed for an instant in the presence of the Just Judge of the whole earth.

We have to admit, therefore, that, apart from Heaven, the abode of the Blessed, and Hell, that place of torment whence there is no escape, there is a middle state of expiation in which the souls of the just who in this life have not yet made full satisfaction for the consequences of their sins, are purified and "made perfect," while suffering pains "above all earthly pains," which have been declared by Doctors of the Church to equal in their

intensity the pains of Hell, except that hopelessness—that awful sense of irretrievable loss which is the worst torment of the damned—is absent; and having thus paid their debt to the last farthing, aided by the prayers and Masses of the Church Militant on earth, are released from their prison and enter into the Kingdom of God.

II.—Purgatory as a State of Cleansing.

Etymologically, Purgatory implies the notion of purification or of cleansing. Not only is it a prison for the punishment of the sinner until full satisfaction has been made for each item of the debt of sin, but it is a state of preparation where the soul is cleansed and purified to make it fit for entrance into the Holy City, the New Jerusalem. St. John, the Apostle of purity, the chosen friend of God Incarnate, records in the Apocalypse[7] the glories of that new creation "coming down out of the heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. Its walls as of jasper-stone; the twelve gates of pearl, the streets . . . as of pure gold, like to clear glass . . .; the Lamb the light thereof." "But," he concludes, "*there shall not enter it anything defiled*, or that worketh abomination, or maketh a lie, but they that are written in the book of life."

This City, the home of God's chosen people, Jerusalem eternal in the heavens, can admit within its portals nothing blemished, stained, or marred by sin. "There shall be no curse there any more," St. John tells us, "but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it and His servants shall serve Him. . . . They shall see His face." Who can stand before the Lord and live? What sinner, with the least defilement upon his soul, can deem himself worthy to see the face of God? So long as his garment of baptismal innocence is stained by even one venial sin, the greatest saint that ever lived cannot hope to enter "Jerusalem above, the Mother of us all," the home of perfect sanctity.

How, then, it will be naturally asked, is Heaven peopled? The Church has a logical, a reasonable, an eminently satisfactory answer to the question. She, the Bride of the Lamb, tells us that after death there is a state of preparation, of disciplinary

[7] Chap. 21, *passim*.

pain, of cleansing and of purification, for every soul that leaves this life with the smallest defect to be remedied. She teaches her children of a purgative process to be undergone for sin, of a searching, purifying fire that is to try the heart and the reins. She warns us, in strict conformity with Holy Scripture (the Word of God of which the Church is the authorized Guardian and Interpreter), that there remains after the redeemed and forgiven soul has opened the dark door of death, a place where its transgressions, as yet unexpiated in regard to their temporal consequences, have to be punished, a Purgatory where the traces of every sin have to be burnt away.

Purgatory is doubtless primarily a state of punishment in which the debt due to the Just and Righteous God is fully paid; but it is also, in and through that pain, a means whereby the soul is cleansed and purified, and, plunged in the "penal waters,"[8] emerges at length in spotless purity conformed in all things to the Divine Will. For all true punishment is *remedial*, as well as *vindictive*. A criminal is sentenced to a term of imprisonment not merely to take vengeance on him, but that he may learn thereby to be a better citizen for the future. So, too, a schoolmaster punishes his pupil, or a father his son, in order that they may be fitted by the discipline of bitter experience to take their places manfully hereafter in the battle of life. Nor is it otherwise with God, our all-wise, all-loving Father. He does not cast us into the prison of Purgatory, or place us in the midst of a terrible, burning flame because He wishes to have His revenge upon us; He punishes us justly, not in anger or vengeance, but in order that we may see for ourselves the consequences of our repeated acts of rebellion against His authority, the foulness of our sin, the unsatisfactory ending to our self-indulgence; and by that knowledge may be raised up, cleansed and healed, from the lamentable state of disorder into which we had fallen, into a closer likeness to the God who is to be our portion for ever. By punishing us He blesses us, "chastening every son whom He receiveth." Purgatory, then, is a state of reformation of character no less than a prison where the soul has to expiate the unfulfilled punishment for its sin.

[8] See Cardinal Newman's *Dream of Gerontius*, p. 59.

Now this remedial purgation is *thorough*, for it is concerned with every part of the soul's nature. The intellect, the memory, the heart, the will; they all have sinned, and they all have to be purified and re-made. Our ignorance has to be corrected, our hardness softened, our affections chastened, our wilfulness destroyed.

1. *The intellect.* How often its judgment has been perverted! Again and again we have forsaken the Fount of Truth for the vain allurements of a godless philosophy or of a materialistic science, filling us with an unbelief inconsistent with that child-like submission to the Law of God and the Commandments of His Church declared by Christ to be the condition of entrance into His Kingdom!

Or, like our first parents, we have been curious to investigate from personal experience the ways of evil only to end, like them, in finding our road barred to the tree of life, "whose leaves are for the healing of the nations."

Furthermore, we read, "There shall not enter it," the heavenly Sion, "anything . . . that maketh a lie." The intellect was intended to show forth truth, and so to be the image on earth of that most truthful mind which is the cause and exemplar of all created things; but we in our wilfulness have prostituted it to the basest uses, making it the instrument of deceit. The devil, our Lord tells us, is "the Father of lies."[9] It is only natural, therefore, that they who misuse their intellects by deceiving their neighbors, place themselves under his banner. Pride, the root-cause of Satan's fall, has taken hold of them; they attempt in their folly to rival the Creator by bringing (in words) out of nothing that which they *say* exists but does not; until, like the fool in the Psalms, they say in their hearts, if not with their lips, that supreme lie, "There is no God." From all these manifold sins of the mind—from ignorance, blindness, and unbelief; from knowledge "falsely so-called";[10] from personal experience of evil, from error in judgment; from falsehood and fraud; from pride, vainglory, hypocrisy, and disobedience—we have to be cleansed before we are fit for entrance into the Presence of God.

2. Then there is the *memory*, that storehouse of the long-for-

[9] St. John 8: 44. [10] I Tim. 6: 20.

gotten past. The greatest saints have complained, in bitter anguish, of the foul phantoms that rose continually before them, beckoning them back to the lusts of their unconverted life. It is related of a faithful servant of God how, when he lay on his death-bed, his mind was tortured by the recollection of sins long since repented, until, to the astonishment of the watchers around him, he continued to cry out, in accents of horror and remorse, "Oh! those faces, those faces." They were the faces of people whom he had wronged by sin.

Here in this life we cannot shake off altogether the memories of a sinful past; the self that has so often sinned remains, in spite of cycles of change, the same identical being carrying with it unconsciously the heavy load of its offences of long ago. And this sad heritage of sin will remain with us beyond the grave; nay, the memory of the disembodied soul will be so fresh and vivid when eternity is at hand, that we can almost say in the words of a modern poet:—"I do not see them here,"—the terrible realities of my former life—

> "I do not see them here; but *after death*
> God knows the faces I shall see,
> Each one a murdered self; with low last breath,
> I am myself; what hast thou done to me?
> And I—and I—thyself (lo! each one saith),
> And thou thyself to all eternity."
>
> —D. G. ROSSETTI.

But no; it is not "to all eternity" for the Catholic who believes in a Purgatory to cleanse the memory as well as the mind—a fire which shall surely eat out every trace of the sad and wicked past. The memory too shall be purified; nothing evil shall remain to disturb the blissful peace of the soul's restored union with its Maker.

3. Not only has the intellect to be reformed and the memory to be purged, but *the heart* with its affections must pass through the cold, cleansing waters of Purgatory. Our hearts, more perhaps than any other part of our nature, have been repeatedly the cause of every kind of sin. By a strong magnetic influence the heart exerts over our actions a subtle sway, driving us this way and that way to satisfy its hunger. We crave for the love of others, and are ready to sin in small things, if not in great, in

order to gain it. The heart which should find its rest in God, the true Lover of the soul, wanders hither and thither after the loves of earth only to end in dissatisfaction. Not indeed that all friendship or love is empty. The Eternal Son Himself chose a particular companion to be the recipient of His confidences. No sympathy, no friendship, no love, is wasted so long as they do not separate us from God. Nay; they often lead us directly to Him by inciting us to acts of unselfishness that are truly divine. But we know well how mixed our motives usually are, and how tainted with sin seemingly the best actions become. Selfishness is, in many cases, the root of our heart's desire. This must be eradicated in Purgatory. The affections, emotions, and cravings that influence our lives so potently for good or for evil, have to be regulated, disciplined, purged from all taint of self-seeking or of carnal pleasure, directed God-wards, so that the heart may at length be able to grasp hold of the infinite love that can alone satisfy its longing.

4. Lastly, the *will* must be strengthened by purification. It is the lever, the motive-power of every action, the pivot on which our whole life turns. If the *will* be right, we can do all things. Alas! that it should be just the will that fails us at the critical moment. The rudder is broken; the ship of the soul drifts helplessly, mastered by the strong winds of passion, pride, self-indulgence, unlawful desire. The will is weak, and the character is ruined. How true to every soul's history are the Apostle's words: "I know that there dwelleth not in me, that is to say in my flesh, that which is good. For to will is present with me, but to *accomplish* that which is good, I find not. For the good which I will I do not, and the evil which I will not that I do."[11] We see what is right; we consent to it that it is good; but the will sinks downward to the earth, at the mercy of every sinful desire, and we fall away from God to break the laws which we delight in, according to the inward man.

The will, then, above all else, needs purification, and strengthening, and discipline; it must go through the fiery trial that it may be restored to its rightful supremacy as ruler of the soul and all its powers.

[11] Romans 7 : 18.

Such is the second great purpose of Purgatory: to cleanse the soul's defilements, to remedy its defects, to enlighten the intellect, to purify the memory, to detach the heart from earthly desires, to set the will God-wards, and so to prepare the whole being, repaired, strengthened, disciplined, refined, for entrance into the Heavenly City through whose gates of pearl nothing defiled or sinful may pass.

W. R. CARSON.

Shefford, England.

IN FATHER MARTIN'S LIBRARY.

VI.—MORE SMOKE—PROSPECTIVE CHANGES.

"THAT was a good story, and just like the Professor. They say he is a passionate smoker, and would do without three meals in succession rather than miss his cigar."

"Not at all—they exaggerate. I know him well from the time we were together in Rome. He rarely smokes, unless it be to avoid oddity in the company of smokers. But he is a philosopher and uses tobacco to get others interested in conversation, as in the case related by Father O'Keefe. Indeed I have heard him say that he never goes out without a cigar-case. He calls it his 'magic box.'"

"That is rather singular. And you say he is not fond of smoking"?

"I should not say that. I believe he looks upon a cigar or a snuff-box as the readiest means of making friends; and in this he seems to be right. Take the instance we have just heard, or that of a man who is on journey, say in a railway coach. His travelling company may be either reserved, or silent for lack of a common topic of conversation, or he may be naturally distrustful of strangers whom he does not know. But let him light a cigar and ask the other to join him, and the spell is broken. Disposition and character show themselves at once to a keen-eyed observer in the ways in which a man handles a cigar, or even in the manner of his refusing to smoke, that is in the reasons he may give for abstaining from smoking. I know of no other means by

which the genuine nature of a man is called to the surface so readily, as by a cigar; unless it be sea-sickness, which is the best leveller of social distinctions and makes the traveller sympathetic, thus inducing him to expose his true inner self. Or take the instance of two men living under the same roof, meeting each other frequently, and therefore liable to have their little "spats" and differences in argument. It happens that they fall out, call each other fools, and by the next morning realize that they were both correct in their estimates, and that they had only mistaken the persons in the heat of contention. Yet neither of them has the pluck to acknowledge the discovery or make an apology. What they lack is a proper method of approach. Each, although knowing himself in the wrong, is too sensitive to make a formal overture for reconciliation, fearing a possible rebuff, and naturally enough unwilling to be snubbed. Or even granted that there be no repugnance on one side or the other to acknowledge the error, yet apologies are at times unwise, especially when you deal with a narrow-minded man who is disposed to mistake another's humility for his own superiority, thus being apt to widen the breach by an air of condescension with which he accepts the acknowledgment of a mistake instead of laughing it away. In both these cases, let the two men have a couple of cigars between them, or let one offer the other a light or a pinch of snuff, and the difference between them vanishes without words like smoke."

"Yes, and as for the pinch of snuff," said Father Bernardo, "I can vouch for its virtue in another way. We had a Father who taught us moral theology in the novitiate; an Italian, with a mind sharp and pointed as a Sicilian stiletto, yet at the same time he was a man scrupulously careful of his words. Well, it often happened during the discussion of cases of conscience in what he called our *cerchiettino*—a little circle composed of the cleverest students chosen from the higher class of theology, and attended also by some of the Fathers—that rather puzzling questions were hurled at him, representing opposite opinions. In these cases he would rarely, despite his naturally quick and decisive manner, answer at once. I see him before me now, as some one throws an objection at a statement supported by him. He would look at the questioner; then look down before him, gather his habit over

his knees, take a large red bandanna from his wide sleeve, blow his nose, wipe his mustache and long beard, and then stop as if to collect his thoughts. After a little he would take out his snuff-box, which was large enough to accommodate the contents of a half-pound jar, tap it two or three times, slowly take a pinch between his fingers, and after holding it there for a half-minute deliberately move it to his nose; then, having expressed his satisfaction with the flavor by a prolonged sniff, he would close the box with a bang and deliver his well-considered and well-worded distinction. It used to amuse us greatly to see him look up triumphantly after all these manœuvres, as if to say, 'Jupiter took snuff at the contempt and settled him.' And of a truth the secret of his profound and analytical thinking seemed to be all in that snuff-box. Its use gave him time to reflect as no other contrivance could have done, without creating a sense of awkward or unnatural suspense which might have left the false impression upon the younger students that the hesitation in a man usually so ready was the result of uncertain knowledge."

"Curious, but, I am sure, quite true; and I fancy that this service of the snuff-box as an expedient to give time for formulating an opinion is responsible for the partiality which professors and judges of the Bench show for that form of tobacco; it is a capital powder which needs not to be kept dry, makes no smoke, and does not even need to be fired in order to transmit the shot."

"For my part I have found," said I, "the cigar a convenient form for keeping in good humor our man who drives me to the hospital. He has often to take me out of his way to visit old Harriet, who keeps me listening to her imaginary stories of pain and sleepless nights, whilst Jerry is waiting, and occasionally he gets fidgety for fear of being behind time at the chapel, for he has a desperate respect for the Mother Abbess, who pretends to scold him when late, though she knows that it is not his fault. But when he gets a cigar he forgets all his worry, especially if I tell him it is one out of Father Martin's box."

"Indeed it is marvellous how a cigar sometimes helps you out when a man does you a service which has perhaps no precise money value, yet which you feel it necessary to recognize in some way. It is a 'tip' which is neither expensive nor unbecom-

ing a gentleman, and is apt to produce a better effect upon the receiver than ten times its value would do if it were given in coin."

"There is good sense in the motto on some tobacco-jars,— how does it run?—

> Sweet nicotina, in this jar of clay,
> Will stifle and drive old care away.
> It is no waste that unto ash she burns,
> Since all her substance into clouds she turns.
> Keep me on hand, and as the fumes arise
> You'll find a-*jar* the gates of Paradise.

"A profane mixture, I suspect," said Father Martin, "of verses from Cope and I don't know whom else."

"It is rather strange that Shakespeare makes no allusion to tobacco," said Father Bernard, "at least not to my knowledge. Ben Jonson and his contemporaries knew it well enough, though they seem to have preferred to indulge in jests at the expense of the smokers of their time."

"I think Shakespeare knew the cigar and liked it well enough. One can hardly imagine him as the jolly companion of Raleigh and Bacon at the 'Mermaid' without his tasting of the favorite weed brought over from Virginia. No doubt Raleigh, who incurred the displeasure of James I, did not find that it was to his credit in the King's eyes that he had introduced tobacco into English court society. At all events James was a great hater of the smoking habit, and that may account for Shakespeare's reticence on the subject. For the rest, nearly all the great poets seem to have been fond of the pipe. Ruskin is the only exception that occurs to me. Even Emerson could spend hours in the company of men like Carlyle, the two sitting by each other's side with a pipe amid their musings. Perhaps the most pronounced lover of the pipe was Tennyson. He rarely smoked a cigar; but his den, at the top of the house, was ornamented with all sorts of pipes, which had at the same time their practical use. There were hookahs, narghiles, meerschaums, and dhudeens; and his friends who came to see him after working hours could take their choice of brands—Virginia, Connecticut, Perique, Lone Jack, Killikinik,

or Highlander. He himself preferred the old-fashioned clay pipe, breaking it after he had emptied it, and taking another. And whilst the clouds were rising, he seemed to feel most happy amidst the confusion of manuscripts and books piled up on chairs, shelves, tables, or strewn on the floor."

"Did you read the account of a recent London mission given by Father Bernard Vaughan, brother of the late Cardinal? It stated that he had a series of special services for the workingmen in the slums of the city, and that, at the close of the last meeting, he presented each member of his humble and temporary congregation with a briar pipe as a Christmas gift."

"That was a sensible idea, indeed, for the poor people do want some comfort, and when they realize that a priest feels for them in their natural wants, they will follow him in and believe what he tells them of their supernatural necessities. I always found it the most effective way of gaining the confidence of the prisoners whom I had to attend whilst in San Francisco, to treat them to a plug of tobacco before I ever gave them a prayer-book or a word of religion."

"I see now why some German *parochus jovialis* writes in the *Pastoral Blatt*, that one of the things in which a pastor ought to instruct young women who come to be married is, how to fill their husband's pipe and light it. If the tired spouse happens to come home after a day's hard work, he may be out of sorts, and this kind of attention invariably softens the hardest temper."

"Oh, I knew a man," interjected Father Bernard, "who broke off an engagement of marriage because the lady had an insurmountable prejudice against tobacco. The couple were excellently suited to each other, and both were models of social and Christian virtue. But the young man, who was a fine writer and critic in the Art Department of *The Tribune*, vowed that he could not make his living if he could not smoke. He found it absolutely impossible to get together his ideas for an article until he had lit his pipe."

"That recalls one of Rudyard Kipling's rather good pieces, called *The Betrothed*. I think you will find it in that Common-Place Book, right behind your chair, Father Waldon. It is a recent clipping, taken from the *Sun*,—look somewhere near the end

of the book. Probably Father Bernard knows it. If not, you might read it for us."

"Yes, here it is."

THE BETROTHED.

Open the old cigar-box, get me a Cuban stout,
For things are running crossways, and Maggie and I are out.

Open the old cigar-box; let me consider a space,
In the soft blue veil of the vapor, musing on Maggie's face.

Maggie is pretty to look at, Maggie's a loving lass,
But the prettiest cheeks must wrinkle, the truest of loves must pass.

Open the old cigar-box;—let me consider awhile;
Here is a mild Manilla, there is a wifely smile.

For Maggie has written a letter to give me my choice between
Her wee little womanly love and the great old Nick O'Teen.

And I turned my eyes to the future that Maggie and I must prove,
But the only light on the marshes is the will-o'-the whisp of Love.

Will it see me safe through my journey or leave me bogged in the mire?
Since a puff of tobacco can cloud it, shall I follow the fitful fire?

Open the old cigar-box; let me consider anew—
My dear old friends, who is Maggie, that I should abandon *you?*

A million surplus Maggies are willing to bear the yoke;
And a woman is only a woman, but a good cigar is a smoke.

Light me another Cuba; I hold to my first sworn vows,
If Maggie will have no rival, I'll have no Maggie for spouse!

"Why here is quite a selection of things on the subject of tobacco"! I exclaimed as I turned over the pages of Father Martin's scrapbook.

I owe to smoking, more or less,
Through life the whole of my success;
With my cigar I'm sage and wise,
Without, I'm dull as cloudy skies.
When smoking, all my ideas soar,
When not, they sink upon the floor.
The greatest men have all been smokers,
And so were all the greatest jokers.
Then ye who'd bid adieu to care
Come here and smoke it into air.

"I am astonished, Father Martin," said the Friar, "to see that you still treasure these eulogies, whilst in fact you seem to have entirely abandoned the habit of smoking."

"Well," replied the older priest, "I still continue to collect desultory bits for that scrapbook in order to complete what I began long ago. In the earlier part of that folio there are no doubt numerous references to the same subject, for I always realized the beneficent influence of a custom that has become so general the world over, and by which kind Providence manages to increase the cheerfulness and the good done through its ministry. Of course tobacco may be abused, and in some respects it seems an altogether unreasonable form of enjoyment. But it is much like certain modes or customs in dress. They make the wearer uncomfortable, and they would perhaps be ridiculous, if they did not serve a secondary purpose which is commendable, and the influence of which, though less apparent, goes deeper. Fancy an ordinary man appearing in society with flaming red trousers or with a brass-plate or iron corset covering his body; yet in the soldier that which seems ridiculous otherwise, rather inspires respect for the military calling. You wonder why I, despite my appreciation of the weed, do not smoke. I will tell you: I believe in smoking for a purpose, even though that purpose be simply recreation. Smoking as a mere habit, and especially the common habit of smoking in public, appears to me unreasonable, or to say what is truer, I have never seen any rational excuse for it. Where men are together by themselves, in the smoking-room, or in single company, the practice has something of a purpose. It helps the conversation, and gives a sort of congeniality to the social atmosphere; it is a concession to the obligations of convivial intercourse; for, as Thackeray says somewhere, men, with pipes or cigars among them, have great physical advantages in conversation. You may stop talking if you like, but the breaks of silence never seem disagreeable, being filled up by the puffing of the smoke; hence there is no awkwardness in resuming the conversation, no straining for effect, sentiments are delivered in a grave, easy manner. The cigar harmonizes the society, and throws an agreeable air at once around the speaker and the subject of conversation. Thackeray thought that the 'monstrous' good

breeding of the Turks and American Indians was due to their habit of smoking. He believed that it generated a style of conversation, contemplative, thoughtful, benevolent, and unaffected; and he tells 'his dear Bob' that at home he used to do it 'up the chimney rather than not do it,' though he avowed this as a crime. In all this I fully agree with him. Tobacco is, like wine, a gentle stimulant, a soothing anodyne, a cementer of friendship. Whilst it is well, perhaps, to be armed with this charming composer of happy feelings and agreements, its use has a limit, at least with the wise or with those who base all their actions on rational motives. To carry a cigar in one's mouth merely because of the stimulating or pleasant effect which it produces seems to me as incompatible with well-regulated motives of right living as if a man were to carry a bottle of wine around with him; for the latter serves exactly the same purpose as the former."

"There is some difference, Father Martin," said I, "it would not be so convenient to carry a flask of wine as it is to carry a cigar."

"And would you, if it were only a question of convenient carrying, allow that a sober gentleman or a priest might flourish the flask and refresh himself on the boulevard every now and then under the public gaze? I confess it does not strike me as becoming, and least of all compatible with the gravity and dignity of our calling. One rarely sees a gentleman of the true stamp smoke in public streets, for there is in the habit something that savors of self-indulgence, and men demand of us a certain exterior indicative of self-control. Well, I meant to say, that observing occasionally the general effect of a man flourishing a lighted cigar in the highway, first led me to think of the necessity or rather the reasons which I had in my own case for the use of tobacco. And, considering my age and the limitations of my social intercourse, I thought that Father Waldon would forgive me if I ceased to smoke. He himself is so moderate in all things that I was sure not to scandalize him or to lessen the harmony of our pastoral life. For the rest, I saw no reason for my continuing the habit, though I have made no vow, and if I thought it advisable to use the cigar as a torch for lighting some such fire in the moral order as you and Father O'Keefe have specified in your admirable illustrations, I should at once have recourse to it."

"I see you are wise, Father Martin, and some day I may follow your course—if P. Guardiano permits or *advises*. Of course about the smoking in the public highways of the city, I quite agree with you. It may not be wrong, though some think it vulgar. But it looks a bit irregular."

Father Martin was called out, and I was on the point of taking Father Bernard to my room, as he meant to stay with us for some days, when the pastor bent his head through the open door saying:

"Wait, I wish to have a word with you on another subject before you retire."

After a lapse of a quarter of an hour, during which we discussed our genial host's habits and thoughtful method of life, Father Martin returned. He had the letter in his hand which Father O'Keefe had brought with him from the Bishop.

"I have a bit of news which concerns our young friend here," said he, but it was difficult to glean from his countenance whether it was good news or not.

"The Bishop contemplates a change in our household. He has returned upon the proposition which you remember, Father Waldon, he made to you last year, and which, at my request, he reconsidered, at least for the time being."

"Oh, I hope," said I, "you can prevail on him to select some one else for that mission and leave me here, at least until the church which is now going up under the supervision of Father Hardnot is completed. I have no talent for building."

"You see, Father Bernard," said the pastor, "the parish at Hobart has been somewhat mismanaged from the beginning. The young priest sent there had hardly any experience, and no natural qualifications, for the task of building up a congregation. He came over to this country, I understand, at the suggestion of his uncle, the old Vicar, who, as you know, has a weakness for locating his family. He succeeded in persuading the Bishop to assign the young priest to the place, and indeed the choice seemed in some respects well advised. It was known that there had been differences between the people and the pastor from the neighboring French parish of St. André, who had formerly attended the mission; and the likelihood was that these difficulties would con-

tinue, though perhaps in some other form, unless a stranger who was able to plead ignorance of antecedents could take hold of the situation. The new pastor seemed for a while to do well; he wisely kept aloof from his neighbor of St. André, though not in a way to arouse the suspicion of unfriendliness. But in time it became clear that he mistook the character of his flock. He set about to build a new church forthwith, thinking it unnecessary to consult anyone but his uncle as to the best method of proceeding in the matter. The congregation which, owing to the steady growth of the new steel manufacture in the neighborhood, was rapidly increasing, would, he naturally expected, supply the requisite money. But some of the more influential members of the parish who had already gathered ire from their dealings with the former pastor, felt dissatisfied with the new regime, and were slow to respond to his demands, which, it appears, were not always made in a very graceful manner. After fourteen months they sent a petition to the Bishop in which they objected to the method of their priest. They stated that they held in trust a considerable amount of money collected with a view of building a church, before the new pastor had come to them. They were willing to give up this sum without reservation to the Bishop, but wished to say that it was evident the money would be squandered by their pastor in architectural experiments wholly uncalled for, if it were entrusted to his sole management. Whilst they were anxious to treat him respectfully and to obey him in matters spiritual, they believed it their duty to lay before the Bishop certain facts which would enable him to judge whether they acted properly in protesting against his method of obliging them to pay for a building enterprise evidently useless. Their specific complaint was that the foundations of a new church had been built without any regard to their needs in the near future, which would render its size altogether inadequate to accommodate the congregation; that the plans were designed by an architect of the town after the pattern of a Protestant church in what they called the mixed English minster style, with no indication of Catholic exterior except that a number of crosses were placed upon the various Gothic roof partitions; the sanctuary was evidently too small, barely accommodating the altar, whereas there was a very large baptistery which it was

explained might be used as a sacristy, but which bore much more the semblance of a Baptist church annex, serving as a vestry-room or reception hall for the Protestant minister. In other words, they affirmed that the architect, though possessed of a good business character, had no intelligence of the requisites of a distinctly Catholic church, and that the priest was being misled by the plausible pretext that the work would be done at greatly lessened expense by reason of certain opportunities for obtaining cheap building material which the architect and contractor could obtain. Under the circumstances, however, the cost, no matter how small, was merely money thrown away, as the building was surely unsuitable for its pretended purpose. It appears the people were right."

"But then the plans must have been submitted to the Diocesan Building Committee," suggested Father Bernard.

"Oh, yes, they were. But the Building Committee considered its main obligation to be the consideration of the financial liability involved. It never struck any one of the members to examine the plans from the architectural point of view, since we took for granted that the details of construction, provided they came within reasonable limits of expenditure, were a matter of local consideration and taste, which the pastor, and those of his people whom he mainly depended on for resources, might settle to their own satisfaction."

"I have no doubt" said P. Bernard, "the original purpose of the formation of the Diocesan Board was to supervise the building operations of pastors and religious communities. Such supervision tends to prevent imprudent ventures on the part of individual operators which would end in failure, and oblige the diocesan authorities to shoulder the consequences. Don't you think, however, that the control ought to extend farther, and test likewise the adequacy of each building for the purpose designed, and particularly to see that our churches keep their distinctive features as places of Catholic worship?"

"Unquestionably; and in the majority of cases that is done, I imagine. Probably the fact that the Vicar, whose membership on the Board is rather an honorary appointment due to his long services in the diocese, patronized the plan of his young nephew,

had something to do with its passing unchallenged. At all events, the style of the building was not the only complaint, for that error might still be remedied, since little more than the foundation-walls of the new church are up. The people dislike the manner of the young priest, who seems to ride rough-shod over their sensibilities, though, I confess, to me he appears quite an humble and nice young man. Father Waldon and he have their little 'spats,' I believe, but they can hardly be serious."

"Serious enough at times," I said, "for Father Hardnot has a most unaccountable way of holding to his opinion against no matter what authority. He often vexes me to the very verge of anger by his peculiar and tenacious views. I hardly ever make a statement in his presence but he will flatly contradict it, and when I bring him proofs from books he appeals to some ancient professor whose identity I cannot make out nor where what he said is to be found, except in Father Hardnot's recollection. Of course he is always agreeable in the company of his elders, but I can imagine him to be quite different with his people."

"It is a pity that he should be inclined to weaken his influence with those parishioners who seem to be rather well disposed. They say he talks perpetually about the 'collections' from the pulpit, and denounces the trustees for not handing over the money which they have in bank, collected, as he says, under false pretences. He treats the whole congregation as his enemies and hardly ever talks to them, believing that preaching the Gospel to such people does no good. Hence there is no feeling of mutual confidence. A few disgruntled members of the congregation go to his home and fill him with suspicion and animosity. I told him one day when he expressed himself freely with me upon the subject of his grievances, that he made a mistake in allowing persons to bring him reports about members of the congregation; but I doubt whether he realized the harm he is doing himself. At all events the Bishop is determined to remove him."

"And Father Waldon is to go there?" asked Father Bernard.

"Yes, that is the intention; in fact it was the original appointment proposed by his Lordship, but as our young *Timidus* here asked to be left in his present sinecure, Father Hardnot obtained

the charge, and the Vicar was so pleased that he promptly made his will in favor of the new cathedral fund."

I thought it my duty, as well as my advantage, to entreat Father Martin to influence the Bishop against the proposed appointment, for I felt an utter repugnance to undertake what seemed to me an altogether hopeless task. I had often enough heard Father Hardnot speak of his congregation in a way which probably prejudiced me, and made me regard them as a hardened and inapproachable set among whom the poorer members had no voice or influence, whilst the wealthier parties were worldly and insolent. I found later from experience that this was not the case, and that the bulk of the congregation were hard-working and docile folk, who, though under the control, to some extent, of the Catholic foreman and more intelligent artisans in the employ of the company which supplied the main industries of the region, were easily managed, when once the prejudices that had grown through misunderstanding in various ways had been removed.

"The difficulty is," said Father Martin, "the Bishop has not a priest whom he could well send there, except our friend here. He spoke once to me of Dr. Grandton, at St. Mary's in the city, who appears desirous of a change, although a country parish would hardly suit him; and it is not a place for which a merely temporary appointment could be made."

"Dear, dear, you don't mean that his Lordship thinks in earnest of putting that polished ivory handle on a rustic fence pole, expecting the two to match? Why I heard the Doctor preach one evening at a May celebration in St. Agnes'. The *élite* who come to the late Mass in our city churches don't usually frequent these evening services on Sundays; nevertheless the address of the Doctor was all directed against the social abuses of the higher classes. I thought to myself the poor people would probably imagine that he was preaching about those *mysteries* which the Catechism says are beyond human comprehension and must be taken on faith; and, though I tried to be reverent all the while, the old story of the priest in the steeple was continually running through my mind."

"What story, please? I have never heard it," said I.

"Oh, it is a doggerel; and I am doubtful whether it is not

maligning the Doctor, whom I hardly know well enough, and who is, I understand, a devout and much respected priest. The rhyme goes something like this:

A parish priest
Of lofty words
Climbed up in a high church steeple,
To be nearer to God
So that he might hand
His word down to his people.
And in sermon script
He daily wrote
What he thought was sent from heaven;
Then he dropped it down
On the people's heads
One day in every seven.
At length God said:
"Come down and die!"
And the priest called from the steeple:
"Where art Thou, Lord?"
And the Lord replied:
"*Down here* among thy people!"

"Well," replied Father Martin, "in this case the steeple would first have to be built, and by the time of its completion the parish priest, whoever he is, would probably have learnt to come down."

"Not a cheering prospect," said I; "and who is, if the question does not sound impertinent, likely to succeed me here with you? I should be glad to attempt a bargain for an exchange with the newcomer if you will only keep me."

"I cannot tell. The Bishop lately received into the diocese a young Austrian who speaks fluently both German and French; and though his English, acquired from books and residence as tutor for two years with an English family, is rather broken, he brings excellent recommendations with him from his former Ordinary."

"To be sure," broke in Father Bernard, "I know the young man—that is, I saw him at St. Peter's shortly after his arrival in the country. Curiously enough, the Vicar was present at the time, and a rather odd encounter took place between him and the young priest, which revealed a good deal of character in the latter. The old gentleman was quizzing the youth good-naturedly

about his antecedents and his ambitions. Finally patting him on the shoulder, he said, in a knowing and half-patronizing way: 'Keep straight, my boy, and don't neglect to pull the old man's leg occasionally, for if you keep out of sight you will be forgotten, as the best of us are. Hold to the safe side. You have got a fine face, and if you are seen often enough at the Cathedral, they'll want you there for your Canon Law; they say the Germans have that down fine. It's the Cathedral, where good looks and a fine voice are not the only recommendation. Call on me and I'll keep you posted — that is, if you know your friends, understand — *comprennez vous?*' The young man looked at first puzzled and seemed a little humiliated; but in a few moments, while the Vicar was still bantering and trying to get him to answer, he took in the situation, and said, in remarkably clear and emphasized English: 'Sir, I don't quite comprehend you, but I fear you mistake me. I am not a clerical flunky, but a priest, who, like a soldier, tends to the duties to which he is appointed, and waits to be called.' There was not much said between them after that, but the young priest had evidently gained a point."

ARTHUR WALDON.

THE ATTITUDE OF MODERN SCIENTISTS TOWARD RELIGION.

BACON, in his *Advancement in Learning*, has the following sentence: "It is an assured truth and a conclusion of experience that a mere sip of philosophy leads the mind to atheism, but deep drafts lead it back to religion." By philosophy Bacon means not only what we understand by philosophy strictly so-called, but also what we now term science. But was not the philosopher of the seventeenth century mistaken in this axiom? At least the history of the nineteenth century appears, or is said, to prove the very contrary. How often do we hear the boast of unbelievers and the lament of loyal Christians that modern science is estranged from God and hostile to religion! It cannot be gainsaid that modern science has frequently been used as a weapon in the modern warfare against Christianity; in fact, it has been the favorite weapon of infidelity. There is hardly a great discovery of science which has not been used by the

apostles of atheism as a means of attacking some truth of revelation, so much so that some good and pious people began to dread the natural sciences as something dangerous in themselves, and as a doubtful good, if not a downright evil and snare. Narrow and unwarranted as such views are, we cannot be censured for saying that we are compelled to look upon the proud achievements of the nineteenth century, in the field of science and discoveries, with a mingled feeling of admiration and regret. Our admiration is called forth by the stupendous progress that undoubtedly has been made; our regret, at seeing the abuse of these achievements. The heavens have been searched, the very bowels of the earth have been laid bare, and grand discoveries have been made; but it is triumphantly asserted that "astronomy has extended the universe so far that there is no room left for God; that astronomy takes the roof from over the head and geology the ground from under the feet of the old faith." The fossilized remnants of a gigantic flora and fauna have been unearthed, and it has been asserted that palæontology and cosmogony prove the Mosaic record of creation to be a senseless lie or, at best, a poetic Oriental myth. The mysterious phenomena of life, of sensation, and intelligence, have been scrutinized, and we are told that the belief in a spiritual and immortal soul is an illusion, a self-deception. The grand powers of nature, the wonderful laws of the universe, have been unveiled, and it is confidently stated that "we can do without the hypothesis of a personal God and Creator." All these assertions, which are vaunted as so many "death-blows" to the old faith, are made in the name of modern science, and we are calmly assured that they are the unavoidable conclusions of the facts and results ascertained by scientists.

These and similar statements, contrary to Christian revelation, are contained, explicitly or implicitly, in a great part of scientific literature, particularly in periodicals and popular lectures. Indeed, the most zealous propagators of such views are to be met with among those who, though not scientists of any name, claim to speak in the name of science, and profess to propound the discoveries of the scientists for the benefit of the general public. However, whilst professing to popularize the results of science, some of them not infrequently outrage science by proposing as

facts what are mere assumptions, unproved and often improbable hypotheses. It is exactly such hypotheses that are used as weapons against Christian revelation. Needless to say, this proceeding is not science, but a new kind of clever charlatanry or scientific jugglery, as dishonest as it is disastrous. THE DOLPHIN[1] has most appropriately designated this sort of "scientific" writing as "Magazine Science." What this term means may be inferred from a statement of the distinguished American psychologist, Professor McKeen Cattell, of Columbia University, who deplores the fact that some of our most popular magazines "do not separate their science from their fiction."

Scientific men themselves are in a great measure responsible for this condition. Some of them have, directly or indirectly, declared themselves antagonists of Christianity, and have avowed that science has compelled them to take this attitude. Still, if one examines the facts on which they base their contentions, it will become manifest that these scientists are no more justified in their assertions than the boisterous popular lecturers. However, their bold statements deeply impress some, while they frighten and disquiet others, although there is not the slightest reason for being disturbed by the assertions of scientists in regard to religious questions. Rightly has Doctor Ward said: "Catholics and Christians generally are much too cowardly, we think, in presence of the so-called scientific world, and give far more weight to its view of things than is at all deserved. Scientific men exhibit a confidence, peremptoriness, sometimes superciliousness, which gives an impression of their having far more of argument at their back than really exists."[2] Moreover, the question should always be asked —although it is hardly ever done—whether scientific men are better qualified than others to speak so positively and dogmatically on philosophical and theological subjects. We think they are not. Men of science are extremely sensitive and grow quite indignant, if a "layman" in their branch seems to trench on their ground. Should they not be equally solicitous not to trespass on grounds to which they are strangers? And yet, as the Duke of Argyll has well said: "Nothing is more com-

[1] July, 1903, p. 77.

[2] *The Philosophy of Theism*, vol. ii, p. 210.

mon than to find men who may be trusted thoroughly on the facts of their own science, but who cannot be trusted for a moment on the place which these facts assume in the general system of truth. Philosophy must include science, but science does not necessarily include philosophy."

How is it, then, that some scientists are ever so prone to venture their peremptory statements about philosophy and religion, and to "speak the last word" on every subject, particularly on those of the highest importance? It is a common and almost natural occurrence that men who undoubtedly know much about one branch of learning, begin to think that they are entitled to speak authoritatively on other subjects. Well has President McCosh, of Princeton, said of such men: "So far as they have advanced any branch of natural sciences, of history, or of political economy, their names will live, and go down with their discoveries to future generations. But it is the mistake of these men, that because they are eminent in some one or two branches of science, say natural history or geology, they are therefore fitted to speculate on all the sciences, on the whole history and destiny of mankind, and to settle or unsettle for ever all the questions bearing on the relations of the universe to its Maker. For this work, some of these men seem to have no aptitude and no calling. I am sure that, in the wide fields of theology and philosophy, they are as ignorant as Comte was in the domains of mathematics and experimental science. Their generalizations have a rashness which would not be tolerated for one instant in the special fields of science in which they have made discoveries. The time is not far off when they, too, will come to their level, which will be considerably lower than their present eminence."[3] A case in point is what Mr. Kegan Paul, the distinguished English publisher and literary man, says in his *Memories*:[4] "So long as Professor Huxley lived in London we were much at his house. He was an interesting and brilliant talker so long as he kept to his own studies. He was, however, totally uninteresting, both in conversation and writing, when he touched on theology. This was not at all his own view, for he seemed to believe himself little short of

[3] *Christianity and Positivism*, Lecture 6.

[4] London, 1899, p. 339.

an inspired teacher on Biblical questions, just as Mr. Gladstone, to the despair of scholars who admired him, posed as a great teacher on Homer." For many great men it would have been better if they had heeded the old adage: *Ne sutor ultra crepidam.*

The wiser expounders of science confess themselves unable to solve any questions which lie beyond their special branch. They admit that, however grand the domain of science is, among all its atoms, earths, and stars, among all that the microscope, telescope, and spectroscope can discover, it can find nothing to give the final solution of the great problems of the existence of God, the nature of the soul, and man's ultimate destiny. The words of one of the greatest physicists of our age are worth quoting in this connection. Professor Helmholtz, of the University of Berlin, wrote to his father: "From your letter it appears to me that you entertain some suspicion that I endorse the trivial tirades of Vogt and Moleschott. Not in the least. I must also earnestly protest against your ranking these two among the representative scientists. Neither has as yet proved by any scientific special research that he has acquired that regard of facts and that calmness in his conclusions which are obtained in the school of natural science. A cautious scientist knows full well that, because he has gained a somewhat deeper insight into the complicate working of the natural forces, he is for this reason not a bit more justified than any other man to give a verdict against the nature of the soul."

A further consideration may be added. Many naturalists devote themselves to the exclusive study of one science, or one branch of a science, which is often very narrow and limited. Now if natural sciences are studied exclusively; in particular if the study of sound philosophy is neglected, the mind becomes one-sided and malformed. Men of such a mind are almost incapable of forming a sane opinion on any question which cannot be decided by the methods peculiar to their own specialty. Thus we meet sometimes with men, great in a special line, who are exceedingly small-minded in all other matters; there are mathematicians who care only for numbers and figures, chemists who appreciate little beyond atoms and molecules, physiologists who talk only of nerves and muscles, geologists who see nothing but

strata and formations. Goethe has ridiculed such warped minds in the famous passage in *Faust:*

> Herein you learned men I recognize :
> What you touch not, miles distant from you lies ;
> What you grasp not, is naught in sooth to you ;
> What you count not, cannot, you deem, be true ;
> What you weigh not, that hath for you no weight ;
> What you coin not, you're sure is counterfeit.

The words of Kant can well be applied to such men: "These Cyclops of science carry an immense weight of learning, a load of a hundred camels, but they have only one eye, that of their own specialty, and lack entirely the philosophic eye." And yet, it is exactly this "philosophic eye" which is needed to see the relations of things and those truths which lie beyond the laboratories and the observatories.

Hence the Christian would have no reason for being disturbed in his faith, even if all the great scientists of the day were atheists. He could calmly deny their aptitude and competency to judge dogmatically on religious questions. But what is the actual state of affairs? What has been the attitude of the leading scientists toward religion during the nineteenth century? For we wish to confine our present paper to this period. It is well known that the pioneers of the natural sciences, the giant intellects of former centuries, Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Newton, Leibnitz, Haller, Linnæus, etc., were loyal adherents of the Christian faith. But it has been frequently and boldly asserted that the "modern" scientists, with a few exceptions, were all antagonists of Christianity, and it is said or implied that they assumed this attitude of hostility toward the old faith on the strength of their scientific discoveries. From this assumed agreement of scientists the apostles of infidelity draw another, and, as they think, a formidable argument in favor of their position. For they say, or mean to say: If all the great minds of our age, the men who have unveiled the mysterious forces of the universe, if they reject revelation and Christianity, who but a priest-ridden or stupid creature can still cling to the unscientific tenets of the Church, and the senseless mysteries of Christianity?

It is a very clever argument, indeed. It appeals to one of the

strongest susceptibilities of human nature, to human pride and vanity. Who does not long to be reckoned among the enlightened, among the *esprits forts*, the strong minds? And who does not shrink back from the thought that he is regarded as one of the weaklings that cling to abandoned theories, to a cause which, if not lost, at the best is only weakly supported in our age? Well, first of all, a weak cause is not always the wrong one. And, as Dr. McCosh has aptly said, "of all acts of cowardice, the meanest is that which leads us to abandon a good cause because it is weak, and join a bad cause because it is strong." History has proved that the weakly supported cause was often the right one; and in the domain of religion it has been the fundamental law that the one true religion was always persecuted, despised, and sneered at by the "wise and powerful of this earth." So it was predicted by the Divine Founder of Christianity, and so it has been all these many centuries. Moreover, the argument of our modern defenders of unbelief is by no means a new one. At the very time when Christ was on earth and engaged in establishing His kingdom of truth, the wise and learned opposed Him. They too said: Which of the learned believe in Him? We read in the Gospel of St. John: "The Pharisees said to them: Are you all seduced? Has any of the rulers believed in him, or of the Pharisees?"[5] Later on St. Paul could tell the Christians at Corinth that there were not many wise ones according to the flesh among them. When the same earnest Apostle appeared before the learned men of Athens on the Areopagus, and spoke to them of the resurrection of the dead, "some indeed mocked, but others said, we will hear thee again on this matter." But only a few, among them Dionysius the Areopagite, accepted Paul's teaching. Two centuries later, when Alexandria was the intellectual centre of the world, the great professors of the Museum and the popular writers of the day, as Celsus and Porphyry, looked down upon the Christians as a contemptible sect of the most ignorant people. And yet, the Neo-Platonists of Alexandria have disappeared, their phantastic doctrines are recorded as mere aberrations of the human mind—and Christianity has remained and has become the greatest power in the world. And so it was in all centuries. Hence the "for-

[5] John 7 : 47, 48.

midable " argument drawn from the number of the antagonists of revelation in the ranks of the scientists, cannot make any impression on one versed in history, except that it calls forth an expression of deep regret for these scientists themselves, and feelings of pity for the poor people that are imposed upon by their bold assertions.

And many there are, indeed, who allow themselves to be deceived by the advocates of infidelity. They themselves cannot examine the scientific problems and alleged results, which are paraded as the " death-blow " to Christianity; but they accept the supposed results on the authority of " the modern scientists "; they accept them on faith. The propagators of atheism and materialism know well that our age is exceedingly credulous. Pascal rightly says: " None are so credulous as unbelievers." It has been said that a very curious book might be written with this title: *The Credulity of Infidels*, and more than one interesting chapter might be furnished by the times in which we live. It is on the credulity of those who are inclined and willing to become unbelievers that the propagators of unbelief base their reckoning, when they assure the world that all the great scientists are opponents of revealed religion, and that, therefore, the old faith does not deserve the allegiance of any enlightened man.

Is this assertion true? Were the great luminaries in the scientific world during the past century unbelievers? It cannot be denied that some scientists openly declared their allegiance to the tenets of materialism and atheism. But were they the greatest scientists, and were they the majority? This is undoubtedly an interesting question. Much light has been thrown on this subject by a recent publication of a German Jesuit, Father Kneller.[6] In this excellent work the author presents the results of his painstaking study of the lives and writings of about 250 scientists of the last century. He has searched the biographies and the works of these men for such passages as express the religious convictions of the great scientists. We shall follow Father Kneller through the different fields of natural science and see what the representative naturalists have said as to their attitude toward the fundamental truths of religion and Christianity.

[6] *Das Christentum und die Vertreter der neueren Naturwissenschaft.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. 1903.

One of the greatest triumphs of theoretical physics is the establishment of the *mechanical theory of heat* and the *law of the conservation of physical force*, or *energy*. It has long been known that man could not destroy the least atom of matter; the law of the conservation of energy states that man cannot add to, or take away from, the sum of physical force, but that this sum in the universe is always the same, no matter how energy is changed and transformed. Haeckel calls the double law of the conservation of matter and force "the first and fundamental law of the cosmos." In this we need not argue against him, but he goes further, declaring that it is also "the first paragraph of the monistic rational religion," *i. e.*, of atheism. It is of great importance to know whether the men who discovered and proved these laws share the views of Professor Haeckel. The mechanical theory of heat and the law of the conservation of energy were established by the American Benjamin Thompson (later on Count Rumford), Sir Humphry Davy, Robert Mayer, Joule and Hirn; the conclusions from these laws which bear on the whole universe, were drawn by Clausius and Thomson (Lord Kelvin). All these men are ranked among the very greatest scientists of the past century. What were their views on religion? Of Count Rumford († 1814) the celebrated scientist Cuvier said: "No matter what Count Rumford's sentiments were towards men"—in this regard he was a pessimist and misanthrope—"they diminished in no way his respect for the Divinity." In his writings he avails himself of every opportunity to express his admiration of Providence, and to hold up to the admiration of others the numberless and various designs and precautions through which God has provided for the preservation of His creatures. The same can be said of Sir Humphry Davy († 1829). In one passage this eminent scientist writes beautifully on the influence of religion, which, as he says, survives all earthly pleasures and increases while the body grows old and feeble and approaches its dissolution; religion is like a bright evening star on the horizon of life, and a beautiful morning star of another better life. He expressly states that materialism always appeared to him as a cold, hard, gloomy, and unintelligible doctrine. The true chemist, he observes, sees God in the many forms of the outer world. Meditating on the variety and beauty of creation, he points to

the Infinite Wisdom whose benevolence has favored him with the opportunity of enjoying this knowledge. Sir Humphry's diary of the last years of his life is filled with expressions of the hope of immortality, with tender sentiments of gratitude toward God and submission to His holy will. "We know very little," he says, "but, in my opinion, we know enough to hope for the immortality—the individual immortality—of the better part of man." Another scientist who contributed much toward the final establishment of these great laws was Robert Mayer (†1878). Tyndall declared in 1891 that "no greater genius has appeared during the whole century than Robert Mayer." Mayer did not always express himself with sufficient clearness and precision on his religious opinions, but that he firmly believed in the fundamental truths of Christianity cannot be doubted in the least. "Scientific truths," he wrote in 1851, "stand in the same proportion to the Christian religion as the brooks and rivers to the wide ocean. I would have yielded to temptations and would have drifted along with the hurricane of passions, had not God's grace, in the bitterest hour of my life, shown me the way." In 1869, at the congress of scientists at Innsbruck, he firmly maintained that it was a gross error to identify, as so many modern scientists do, the actions of the brain with the intellectual processes. "The brain is the instrument of the mind, but not mind itself. But the mind, not lying within reach of what we can perceive by our senses, is not an object for the observation of the physicist or anatomist." And he concluded his remarkable address with these words: "With my whole and entire heart I exclaim: True philosophy must not and cannot be anything else but a preparation (*propaedeutic*) for the Christian religion." In 1871, he wrote, in a letter accompanying one of his "Scientific Lectures:" "The anti-materialistic viewpoint which I have taken, and which, according to Matthew 10: 32, I shall never conceal, is of course maintained here as well." The passage of the Gospel referred to is the text: "Every one therefore that shall confess me before men," etc. Surely, a noble confession of a scientist! Although a Protestant, Mayer was, on the whole, favorably disposed toward the Catholic Church. He admired especially the idea of authority in the Church. For a long time he intended to enter the Church, but then he acquiesced in

the thought that an interior union was sufficient. He had a great aversion to modern German philosophy. One time he was urged to read some of Hegel's works. He soon returned the books, saying that he had not understood a word, nor would he be able to understand one, even if he studied for a hundred years. Probably every one else would have made the same experience, but it is characteristic of Mayer that he frankly stated his experience, and did not stoop before the idol of the day. Nor was his attitude toward Darwinism a friendly one. What he disliked especially was the dogmatic manner in which Darwin explained the origin of life, and he used to apply to him the words of St. Paul: "They are wise in their own conceit." He also declared that Darwinism found so many adherents in Germany, because "people thought they could make capital out of it for atheism."

In England it is Joule (†1889) who is regarded as the originator of the modern theory of heat, rather than Mayer. Let us listen to a few utterances of this great physicist. "The great agents of nature are by the Creator's 'fiat' indestructible. . . . The power of destroying things belongs to the Creator alone. . . . Thus it is that order is maintained in the universe—nothing is deranged, nothing ever lost, but the entire machinery, complicated as it is, works smoothly and harmoniously. And though, as in the awful vision of Ezekiel, 'wheel may be in the middle of wheel,' and everything may appear complicated and involved in the apparent confusion and intricacy of an almost endless variety of causes, effects, conversions, and arrangements, yet it is most perfect regularity preserved—the whole being governed by the sovereign will of God."

Also the eminent Alsatian scientist Hirn († 1890) is a determined opponent of materialism, and he directly attacks the materialistic and pantheistic views of the universe. He claims that matter must have been created, and he advances proofs for the immortality of the soul. As regards the distinguished Englishman Rankine, it will suffice to quote the words of another scientist, Tait, who says: "He (Rankine) was profoundly attached to his parents: and one of the most touching notes in his journal is the brief record of his lasting obligations to them for early instruction in the fundamental principles of the Christian religion and the character of its Founder."

Probably the foremost among living scientists is Sir William Thomson (Lord Kelvin). His strong opposition to materialism is known from recent statements.[7] We quote one or two other passages from his works. "Our own bodies, as well as all living plants and animals, and all fossil organic remains are organized forms of matter to which science can point no antecedent except the will of a Creator, a truth amply confirmed by the evidence of geological history." In an address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, he said as follows: "I feel profoundly convinced that the argument of design has been greatly too much lost sight of in recent zoological speculations. Overpoweringly strong proofs of intelligent and benevolent design lie all around us; and whatever perplexities, whether metaphysical or scientific, turn us away from them for a time, they come back upon us with irresistible force, showing to us through Nature the influence of a free will, and teaching us that all living beings depend on one ever-acting Creator and Ruler."

Some statements of Helmholtz have been quoted previously. He, too, was one of the first to enunciate the law of the conservation of energy; probably he discovered it independently of any other scientists. We have seen, then, that not one of the naturalists who established this great law can be quoted as a defender of materialism. It is unintelligible, therefore, that Haeckel should call this law "paragraph 1 of the monistic religion," as the very men who have discovered and proved it, have not seen any connection between this law and the necessity of admitting atheism. We must suppose, and Haeckel should suppose it as well, that these men knew a little more, or certainly not less, about the bearing of this law than Haeckel himself. But Haeckel has never been conspicuous for logical consistency, or for modesty in his assertions.

In a similar manner we can examine the writings of the representatives in every branch of science. But we can do this only very briefly, however interesting a more detailed account might be. Let us take *mathematics*. Cantor says that the celebrated Euler, "like most great mathematicians," was deeply religious without any bigotry, and every evening conducted per-

[7] See THE DOLPHIN, July, 1903, p. 79.

sonally the family devotion. He wrote a book entitled *Defence of Revelation against the Free-Thinkers*, the publication of which, in close proximity to the infidel court of Frederick the Great, proves the moral courage of the man who did not fear the sneers of the infidels. It is true, Euler died in 1783, and we wish to confine our investigation to the nineteenth century. But Cantor's words apply to the greatest mathematicians of this century equally well. One of the foremost mathematicians of all ages was Gauss (†1855). It is almost incredible, and yet well authenticated, what is related about the premature brilliancy of this mathematical genius. But we need not write an ecomium of his achievements, for our purpose it will be enough to state that he was a firm believer in a personal immortality of the soul. "What are we," he writes, "without the hope of a better future? We are compelled to admit that besides this material world there exists another, purely spiritual order, with as many varieties as the one we live in."

Two years after the death of Gauss, a mathematician departed from this life who is as great as Gauss—namely, Cauchy. Concerning his attitude toward religion, this one statement will suffice: He was a loyal and devout Catholic, an active member of the Society of St. Vincent, of the Society of St. Francis Regis, and of similar Catholic associations. On his deathbed he received the last sacraments with a touching piety. He was a personal friend of several Jesuits, particularly of the famous Father de Ravignan, and on two occasions he wrote pamphlets in defence of the persecuted Order. In one of these publications he makes a formal profession of faith, in which he says: "I am a Christian, *i. e.*, I believe in the Divinity of Christ, with Tycho Brahe, Copernicus, Descartes, Newton, Fermat, Leibnitz, Pascal, Grimaldi, Euler, Guldin, Boscovich, Gerdil; with all the great astronomers, with all the great physicists, with all the great mathematicians of the past centuries. I am a Catholic, a sincere Catholic, as were Corneille, Racine, La Bruyère, Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Fénelon." Other distinguished mathematicians who were opponents of atheism are the Catholics Vicaire, Binet (†1856), Puiseux (†1883), Hermite (†1901), and Buoncompagni; then Professor Weierstrass, of the University of Berlin, at whose death in 1897 a paper, not at all friendly to the

Church, remarked: "Weierstrass, Catholic and not married, with his beardless, clear and kind face, impressed one as being a learned clergyman!"

A word must be said on the immortal Laplace, the "French Newton." He is often quoted as an atheist. This contention is based on the following anecdote. Laplace had offered one of his works to Napoleon, who remarked: "Newton in his works has spoken of God; I have read your work and have not found the name of God in it." To this the mathematician is said to have replied: "I do not need that hypothesis." Now, the anecdote is not at all authenticated. It is true it was spread even during the lifetime of Laplace. When the mathematician, shortly before his death, heard that a biographical work contained this anecdote, he asked Arago to demand its suppression from the publisher. This proves sufficiently that Laplace is quoted as an atheist against his will. But even if he made the remark, it does not prove that he denied the existence of God. Newton had thought that in the course of time a collision might occur among the planets, which would necessitate a direct interference of God. It is quite possible that Laplace meant to say that he did not need *this* hypothesis. Passages in Laplace's *Exposition du système du monde* go far to prove that this was really his meaning. On the other hand, it is true that Laplace cannot be quoted as a model Christian. There are passages in his works which show the influence of the false philosophy of the eighteenth century. But he was not an atheist, and when death approached he asked for a priest to make his account with God.

In *astronomy* we meet the names of many men who were devout Christians. The Theatine Father Piazzi discovered Ceres, the first of the planetoids, a discovery of far-reaching importance in astronomy. But he is not the only Catholic priest who acquired fame as an astronomer. The secular priest Oriani, the Piarists Inghirami and Cecchi, the Barnabite Denza, the Benedictines Koller and Reslhuber, the Jesuits de Vico, Perry, and, above all, the celebrated Secchi, gained a reputation all over the scientific world. The two German astronomers, Olbers and Bessel, speak in their letters in such a manner of God that any favoring of materialism is absolutely excluded. John Frederick William

Herschel (†1871), the great English astronomer, was not only a believer in Christianity, but thoroughly pious. The *Dictionary of National Biography* says of him: "His private life was one unbroken tenor of domestic affection and unostentatious piety." He frequently spoke against the materialistic view of the world. The great Leverrier (†1877), who is known even to the layman in astronomy on account of his ingenious discovery of Neptune, was known in France as the "clerical senator." Faye, another distinguished French astronomer (†1902), in his work *Sur l'origine du monde*, speaks in a thoroughly Christian manner of the relation of modern science to the Biblical account of creation. In another work he shows how the study and contemplation of nature must lead to the knowledge of God. Two eminent astronomers, Lamont and Kreil, were pupils of the Benedictine Fathers and devout Catholics. A very able astronomer was also Professor Heis, of Münster (†1877). He was a fervent Catholic, who publicly professed his faith during the "Kulturkampf," even at the risk of personal slights and pecuniary injuries. In his family the rosary was said every evening, and he sent one of the first copies of his excellent *Atlas Stellarum* to Pope Pius IX, and used to show the Holy Father's letter of thanks with joyful pride to his friends. Many other astronomers could be quoted who, by their writings, have proved that the contemplation of the heavens, far from estranging men from religion, may lead them to real piety. Verily: *Coeli enarrant gloriam Dei et opera manuum eius annuntiat firmamentum.* "The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of His hands." (Psalm 18.)

The nineteenth century is preëminently the century of *electricity*, and truly glorious are the achievements in this line. Behold our street cars, electric light, telegraph and telephone, and the many other applications of the mysterious power! These applications were possible only on account of the brilliant discoveries of scientists. The leading men in this field are Galvani, Volta, Ampère, Faraday, Coulomb, Ohm, Siemens, Oersted, Maxwell, de la Rive—names familiar to any one who has made the most elementary study of electricity. Let us state it immediately that all these men were believers in the Christian revelation. Galvani does not exactly belong to the nineteenth century, but we may enumer-

ate him here, as he died but two years before the beginning of the century. He was a fervent member of the Third Order of St. Francis; this characterizes sufficiently his religious convictions. Volta (†1827) was a zealous Catholic, who publicly explained the catechism to children. Ampère (†1836), after a period of religious indifference and doubt, became a thorough Catholic. Faraday (†1867), whom Tyndall and Du Bois-Reymond style the greatest experimentalist the world has ever seen, was a sincere Christian, in as far as he firmly believed in the Divinity of Christ, although he rejected many other dogmas of the Anglican and Presbyterian churches—he belonged to the Glassites or Sandemanians, in which sect he was an elder and delivered a course of sermons. He never could discover any contradiction between faith and science. "Our philosophy," he writes, "whilst it shows us these things, should lead us to think of Him who hath wrought them; for it is said by an authority far above even that which these works present, that the invisible things of Him," etc.[8] When in 1860 defenders of Darwinism quoted him as an antagonist of the Bible and revelation, Faraday declared that there was not a word of truth in such assertions. "If I have given offence, it has been because I was supposed to pay too much respect to the Bible, which I believe to be the Word of God." Well has Father Kneller observed: "The half-educated man who is smoothly borne along the street in an electrical car, who from his room converses with his friend miles distant and recognizes his voice, who sends a message to America or Australia, far in advance of the fastest train or steamer, this man often smiles with a superior and sneering look when he sees an old woman telling her beads, or when the conversation turns on priests and the Church, and he thinks that the great discoveries of this age of electricity have given the death-blow to the old religious prejudices. But by so thinking he betrays his own ignorance; he forgets that the great intellects to whom, in the first place, these great modern achievements are due, have humbly meditated on, and bowed before, the truths of Christianity. And the clever hands under whose touch the hidden forces of electricity first manifested themselves have often closed in humble prayer, and, in the instance of Volta and Ampère, have even not

[8] Romans 1: 20.

disdained to hold the beads. Therefore, no matter how things stand in other fields of science, so much is certain, that in the field which more than any other attracts the attention of the ordinary man, infidelity does not find the authorities with whose name and fame it could cover its hostility toward Christ."

Other men distinguished for their discoveries in the field of electricity were no more defenders of materialism than those mentioned hitherto. Maxwell (†1879) was a pious Protestant. He, too, presided over the daily family devotions. "He was a constant regular attendant at church and seldom, if ever, failed he to join in our monthly late celebration of Holy Communion, and he was a generous contributor to all our parish charitable institutions. He had gauged and fathomed all the schemes and systems of philosophy, and had found them utterly empty and unsatisfying—'un-workable' was his own word about them—and he turned with simple faith to the Gospel of the Saviour,"—these are the words of the clergyman Guillemard. During his last days he made two statements which may be repeated here. To Mr. Colin Mackenzie he said: "Old chap, I have read up many queer religions: there is nothing like the old thing after all;" and "I have looked into most philosophical systems and I have found that none will work without a God." He was an intimate friend of such divines as Lightfoot, Hort and Westcott.

In *optics* the great names are Fresnel, Fraunhofer, Fizeau, Foucault. None of these can be claimed as a defender or friend of un-Christian views; Fraunhofer (†1826), known both for theoretical discoveries (Fraunhofer's lines) and for practical improvements of the telescope, was a fearless Catholic, one who rigorously insisted on the observance of the ecclesiastical laws of abstinence, even when guests were present. This means much, as at Fraunhofer's time there prevailed a great laxity in such matters in Germany. Foucault (†1868), famous both in optics and mechanics, after a period of religious indifference, gradually returned to his Catholic faith, and died reconciled with the Church. One of the more recent eminent representatives in optics was Professor Ketteler, of Münster, who died in 1900, an excellent Catholic.

Distinguished in many branches of natural science was Biot

(† 1862). He was not always an exemplary Christian. There was a time when the recollection of his first communion seemed to be the only remnant of his religious youth. But the experiences and intimate acquaintance with atheists on the one hand and leading Catholics on the other, led him to compare, and finally brought him back to the faith and the piety of his youth, and he was delighted to see his grandson become a priest. Also Regnault, Desains, Becquerel, Plateau, Tait, and Jolly were loyal Christians.

The modern science of *chemistry* is of relatively recent date. Yet its results are truly astonishing. The great names in this department of science are Dalton, Berzelius, Chevreul, Dumas, and Liebig. Dalton's loyalty to religion has never been doubted. Berzelius († 1848) has publicly professed his belief in God and his opposition to the atheistic philosophy. Dumas (†1884), the leading French chemist, was a Catholic, who died after having devoutly received the last sacraments. He was especially fond of speaking on the immortality of the soul. Liebig (†1873) is famous not only for his theoretical discoveries, but still more for most important practical applications of the results of modern chemistry. This great man was a firm believer in God and His wise government of the universe. In a public discourse he mercilesslly condemned the attempts at utilizing the natural sciences as props of materialism. He says that such attempts are not made by the real scientists, but by "dilettanti who from their promenades on the borderlines of science think themselves justified to expound to the ignorant and credulous public how the world, and life in it, have originated, and how wonderfully man has progressed in the exploration of the sublimest things. And the ignorant and credulous public believes these people and not the real scientists, just as it believed in the walking, writing and talking tables." Chevreul (†1889), a Catholic, was not prevented by his brilliant discoveries from saying the rosary of the Blessed Virgin. On several occasions he passed severe censures on materialism. Another eminent chemist, who did also much for the development of industry and commerce in France, was Chaptal, a Catholic, who built the famous roads over Mont Cenis, Mont Simplon, and Mont Genèvre. He was known for his strict uprightness, and toward the end of his life he considered it his sacred duty to pay the debts

of his son. Although this reduced him to poverty, he found means to donate a painting of the Blessed Virgin and a silver monstrance to the parish church of his native place. Schönbein of Basel (†1868), who made very important discoveries (ozon, collodium, etc.), was a pious Protestant and strong defender of Christian dogmas. He was favorably disposed toward the Catholic Church and even the religious orders, particularly the Benedictines. Wurtz (†1884), though a Protestant of liberal views, was never led by his chemical discoveries to doubt the spirituality and immortality of the soul. Klaproth, Friedel and Henry were eminent chemists and sincere Christians; Deville was a staunch Catholic.

Among leading *geographers* the following were believers in Christianity: Ritter, Daniel, the American Maury, Freycinet, and d'Abbadie, a fervent Catholic. The "*father of scientific crystallography*" is Hauy, a Catholic priest, a simple professor in a college in Paris. Another Catholic was Fuchs of Munich (†1856), equally distinguished for chemical, mineralogical and technical discoveries. Not long before his death he concluded a paper with these words: *Omnia ad maiorem Dei honorem et gloriam.* Beudant was a good Catholic, Hausmann a sincere Protestant; both were prominent contributors to the science of crystallography.

Few branches of science have been used more to discredit the Biblical account of creation than *geology* and *palæontology*. On the other hand, such prominent geologists as de Luc, Cuvier, Fuchs, Buckland, De Serres, Miller, Hitchcock, MacCulloch, Pfaff, Dana, and Waagen, endeavored to show that there exists a harmony between revelation and geology. Some have even gone too far in asserting such a harmony. It is enough to show that there exists no conflict between the established results of science and the true meaning of the Bible. But herein great caution is needed. Scientists have read their own ideas into the Bible, others have accepted hypotheses which later turned out to be false, and tried to harmonize the Biblical accounts with such hypotheses. Apparent contradictions are due either to the mistakes of scientists or to a wrong interpretation of the Sacred Books. For our present purpose it is sufficient to mention the names of eminent geologists who assert that there is no contradiction

between the strata of the earth and the pages of the Bible. Such were the above-mentioned men. Other distinguished geologists and palæontologists, and sincere Christians, were Conybeare and Sedgwick, two Anglican clergymen; Beaumont, Bischof, Fraas, Heer, Studer, Quenstedt, Daubree, Dumont. Our great American geologist, Dana (†1895), speaks thus: "The record in the Bible is, therefore, profoundly philosophical in the scheme of creation which it presents. It is both true and divine. It is a declaration of authorship, both of Creation and the Bible, on the first page of the sacred volume. There can be no real conflict between the two books of the great Author. Both are revelations made by Him to man." Among the foremost geologists we find some excellent Catholics: Barrande (†1883), who wrote the dedications and prefaces of his works on the great feasts of the Church: Immaculate Conception, Feast of the Purification, Easter, Ascension, Annunciation, etc.; d'Omalius, the founder of geology in Belgium, was a practical Catholic; Lossen, the "ornament of the Prussian Institute of Geology," a Catholic, died in (1893), his eyes fixed intently on the crucifix; Waagen, too (†1900), was a devout Catholic; Lapparent is a zealous member of the Society of St. Vincent.

Physiology is more closely connected with the higher questions of philosophy than most other sciences. The questions of the nature of life, the soul, the human mind, animal instinct, belong to its sphere, and they form the battle ground between faith and materialism. Johannes Müller (†1858), called "the greatest physiologist of the nineteenth century," was a loyal son of the Catholic Church. So was Schwann (†1882), who, according to Du Bois-Reymond, "stands at the head of the modern physiological school;" to him modern science owes the important "cell theory." Wagner, Volkmann and Vierordt, three leaders among German physiologists, vigorouslydefend the existence of God and the spirituality of the soul. Bernard called the priest before his death; Flourens, for a time a freethinker, returned to his religious (Protestant) belief. It is almost superfluous to say that Pasteur (†1895) was one of the first scientists of our age, and to the end of his life a loyal and fervent Catholic, who frequently approached the Holy Table. A very distinguished biologist was the Belgian Carnoy (†1899),

who was for eight years a parish priest and later, as professor in Louvain, commenced his lectures always with the sign of the cross.

Ehrenberg (†1876), the pioneer in microscopic zoology, was so little a friend of materialism that on many occasions he denounced it as "humbug and a fantastic, sickly tendency of our time which parades under the name of science." A very prominent scientist was von Baer (†1876), who acquired great fame in the fields of zoology, geography, ethnography, and anthropology. Throughout his life he was a strong defender of the teleological view of nature, and more than once expressed his firm belief in the existence of God, although it must be added that some of his utterances sound pantheistic. But shortly before his death he declared that he had renounced pantheism, and returned with full conviction and determination to theism, saying that the "pantheistic conception of God would never do." Agassiz (†1873), to whom the museum of natural history of Harvard owes so much, frequently expressed his belief in the truths of the Christian religion. Van Beneden was a great scientist and pious Catholic. Several eminent zoologists were priests, as Altum, the Lazarist David (†1900), the Jesuit Heude (†1902). One of the founders of *entomology* was a priest, Latreille (†1833). Förster, a great authority in this department, was an excellent Catholic. Among leading *botanists* who were defenders of the Christian view of the world, we mention von Martius (†1868), who ordered a green cross to be sewed on his shroud; "a cross," he said, "because I am a Christian; a green one, in honor of botany." Other Christian botanists were Kielmeyer, the three priests: von Schrank, Leunis, Castracane, and a great number of others.

The difficulties raised against Christian revelation by botanists and zoologists are now all connected with the theory of evolution. Let us state here that this theory,—it is no more than a theory, a working hypothesis, and not yet proved to be a fact,—is in no way atheistic, and that, from the standpoint of revelation, there is no objection to its adoption, if the origin of man be excluded. Following the design of our paper, we remark only that the very fathers and founders of this theory, Lamarck (†1829) and Saint Hilaire (†1844), were opponents of materialistic tenets.

Saint Hilaire saw in the new theory a "further step towards a deeper knowledge of God." Two loyal Catholics, Ampère and d'Omalius, were zealous defenders of the theory; so were two exemplary German Catholics and distinguished scientists, Waagen and Lossen. It should be added that these men did not admit the Darwinian view of evolution. As regards Darwin, he stated himself that he was never an atheist; that is, that he never denied the existence of God, but that his mental attitude was best described by the word *agnostic*. He vacillated between atheism and theism. A year before his death, he had a conversation with the Duke of Argyll. Of this the Duke has given the following account: "In the course of that conversation, I said to Mr. Darwin, with reference to some of his own remarkable works on the 'Fertilization of Orchids,' and upon 'The Earthworms,' and various other observations he made of the wonderful contrivances for certain purposes in nature—I said it was impossible to look at these without seeing that they were the effect and the expression of mind. I shall never forget Mr. Darwin's answer. He looked at me very hard and said, 'Well, that often comes over me with overwhelming force; but at other times,' and he shook his head vaguely, adding, 'it seems to go away.'" Romanes (†1894), Darwin's friend, who at first denied all designs in nature, in the course of time was led by his studies to the belief in the existence of God, and he returned to Christian convictions. In conclusion, we may quote the words of two great American scientists on evolution. Dana writes: "There is here no discordance with the Biblical account of Creation, since in it there is one *fiat* for the first introduction of life, and only three others for that of the animal kingdom, and moreover the language implies growth for the rest, through the laws established by the *fiats*." Our celebrated botanist, Asa Gray, wrote a book for the special purpose of showing that the theory of "natural selection is not inconsistent with natural theology."

Having finished the brief survey of the scientists of the nineteenth century we may now ask: Is it true that the large majority of the great scientists are opponents to Christianity? We must deny this most emphatically. We have met with the names of the greatest scientists of the century, and have found that they believe

in the existence of God and the spirituality and immortality of the soul; these truths constitute the foundation of the Christian religion. And these are practically the only questions which come into consideration in strictly scientific investigations. For the question of miracles is outside the field of science, which deals with the ordinary course of events, whereas miracles are extraordinary events, outside the natural course of things. The question of the character of Christ and His Divinity cannot be attacked on any physical, chemical, or zoological grounds. As regards the Biblical record of Creation, this too lies outside the sphere of the natural sciences, as it all depends on how the six days of this account are to be taken, whether as periods, or visions, or great ideas, and this has to be decided on exegetical grounds.

Besides those who admit the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, we have met with a considerable number of first-class scientists who profess themselves sincere Christians, and not a few of them are devout Catholics. Father Kneller has made the following apt observation: Suppose an infidel scientist, in his hatred of Christianity, would proudly refuse to accept any discovery made by a Christian scientist—the poor man would be in a sorry plight. Is he a chemist, he has to do without Berzelius, Dumas, Liebig, Deville, Chevreul, that is, about the whole of modern chemistry would have to be discovered by him. Is he a physicist, he has to prescind in electricity from the discoveries of Galvani, Volta, Ampère, Faraday, that is from nearly everything that is known in this field. In optics, he would have to go back to the times before Fresnel, Fraunhofer, Fizeau, and would have to take up the antiquated theories of emission; in calorics, little would be left without Mayer and Joule. In astronomy, he has to renounce everything that has been discovered with Fraunhofer's telescopes. So much about the theoretical part. But what would our proud infidel do in active life, in industry and commerce? The unfortunate man has to sit in the dark, unless he is willing to take the old tallow candle, for stearine he owes to the Catholic Chevreul; he has to put out his electric lamps, for the electric current cannot be used without the measurements of the pious Catholics Ampère and Volta, nor can he use the electric cars. Aluminum he cannot use, as it was discovered by the Catholic Deville; in photog-

raphy he is forbidden the collodium of Schönbein; in medicine he has to do without Pelletier's quinine; the whole doctrine of microbes has to be dispensed with, as it is chiefly due to the Catholic Pasteur. And so in numberless other cases he would be thrown back into a condition which we would call intolerable, if he disdained to use what he ultimately owes to the genius of scientists who were sincere Christians.

Perhaps, the objection will be raised that many naturalists were defenders of materialism, and some of these rank high as scientists, as Virchow, Du Bois-Reymond, Berthelot and others. We may remark, in the first place, that scientists who in the beginning defended pronounced monistic views returned more and more toward the dualistic views, the further they progressed in their researches. Haeckel has recently lamented such a change in the case of prominent naturalists of the materialistic camp. As instances of such "psychological metamorphosis," he quotes, besides Kant, such naturalists as Virchow, Du Bois-Reymond and Wundt. He states with regret that Virchow, originally a materialist, who in 1856 expressed his conviction that he would never change his opinions in this respect, by his subsequent actions showed that "his former 'conviction' was a grave error; for twenty-eight years afterwards he defended radically different opinions." Wundt styled the first edition of his *Lectures on the Soul of Man and Animals* thirty years later "the sin of his youth," and in the second edition he advanced entirely different views. "The first edition was purely monistic and materialistic, the second purely dualistic and spiritualistic." It is possible that Haeckel's expressions are exaggerated, but they prove this much, that these eminent scientists became the more cautious in condemning the "spiritualistic" views, the more they advanced in the knowledge of psychological phenomena.

What, then, is the real cause of the infidelity of some scientists? We cannot here enter into a lengthy discussion of the causes that may lead and do lead men to atheism. The causes are many and various, partly in the will and partly in the intellect. St. Thomas teaches that infidelity, like faith, is an act of the intellect, but an act commanded by the will. "Infidelity as well as faith is in the understanding as in its immediate subject; but it is

in the will as its first mover. It is the contempt of the will that causes the dissent of the understanding." Thus the Jews clamored for "signs from heaven," but when they saw the most stupendous miracles, they yet refused to believe; they were *unwilling* to believe. The motives which determine the will may be various. We do not wish to insist on the fact that many reject the Christian dogma because they hate the precepts of Christian morality, "because," as Christ says, "their deeds are evil." But we call attention to another source of infidelity which may be very common among infidel scientists, and this is pride. This, too, has been pointed out by Christ as one of the causes of the unbelief of the Jews: "How can you believe, who receive glory from one another" (John 5: 44). And it was the little ones, the humble souls, that accepted what remained hidden to the wise and prudent of this world (Matt. 11: 25). Many scientists do not pray, and faith is a gift of God which is given to humble prayer. They do not pray, because they are proud and self-sufficient. Yet humility is the gate of faith, and prayer is the natural expression of humility, the acknowledgment of human insufficiency. Learned men receive much praise and admiration, and this is a great danger. They wish to be the oracles of the time, the prophets of a new dispensation, and the apostles of a new gospel, and they disdain to accept a Gospel preached by unlettered fishermen; they refuse to accept a creed which demands the submission of the intellect to dogmas and mysteries, a creed which is the same for the great professor and writer as for the poor farm-hand and workman.

There are also causes of infidelity in the intellect. Some of these advocates of atheism have never received a solid training in religion in their youth. The evil one took away the seed of religion, as the birds picked up the grains that fell by the wayside. Others had received some religious instruction, but they became so much absorbed in their studies that they neglected to practise their religion, in consequence of which the light of faith grew dim and finally became extinct. Or, to use another Scripture simile: "others fell among the thorns and the thorns grew up and choked them." Lastly, as we observed before, the one-sided application to the natural sciences may disable men to perceive

and appreciate the truths of religion. These and similar reasons may sufficiently account for the fact that some scientists are infidels. But it is not science which makes them infidels, otherwise the same effect should have resulted in the case of the men whom we have previously quoted as opponents of atheism. St. Augustine, in his *City of God*, declares that Porphyry's blindness to Christ as the mind of the Father was due to his aversion to Christ's humility, not to any speculative difficulty. The same may be said of many modern infidels. It is the same science in either case, the results are different according to the disposition of the mind and heart of the recipient. Just as the same water produces different results: it makes the gardens and meadows bloom, but it also causes the mud in the street; the same rays of the sun further the progress of living beings and cause putrefraction in the carcass.

A last question demands an answer: If the majority of the great scientists are not infidels, how is it possible that the impression has been caused and prevails at the present day that naturalists, on the whole, are atheists? Well, first of all men are inclined to believe it. There is a tendency in the human mind toward rebellion, from the day that our first parents revolted against God. This spirit of rebellion seizes on everything available: in the days of the renaissance it was the pagan spirit of the classics; then the great apostasy of the reformation; later the shallow philosophy of the English and French free-thinkers, and then the pantheism of the German philosophers; now it is natural science. There is a spirit of the age, and that of our age is largely tainted with materialism; and the natural sciences, which preëminently are concerned with matter, seem particularly to suit that spirit; hence, the danger of unduly insisting on the sciences in modern education to the detriment and neglect of more ideal studies. Then there are the questionable methods of the foremost apostles of infidelity. They wield with special predilection the dangerous weapons of sneer and contempt: "Sapping a solemn creed with a solemn sneer," as one expresses it. The words: antiquated, mediæval notions, priestcraft, metaphysical juggleries, etc., applied to the truths of the old faith, have done more harm than any scientific demonstration. Men are full of

human respect and vanity, and those who have the courage of their conviction, and the heroism of martyrs, are hardly ever in the majority. Another dangerous weapon of the popularizers of materialism is deception. They repeat again and again that the great scientists are all infidels, although it is false. But many will believe it, and gladly lay hold of it as a pretext for throwing off the old faith and its stern precepts which they do not like. Further, in speaking of the distinguished scientists who have been good Christians, the apostles of materialism are careful never to mention this unwelcome fact. It is hushed up in absolute silence. Lastly, the most prominent scientists talk less loudly about themselves and their work than second and third-rate scientists, just as quack doctors "talk bigger" and advertise in larger type than eminent physicians. Thus it happens that in England Huxley, Tyndall, and Spencer are better known than Faraday or Maxwell; and in Germany Haeckel and Vogt are known to every one, whereas even educated people would have to think hard to recollect who and what Mayer or Gauss or Fraunhofer or other great men were. The propagators of materialism frequently are the popular lecturers who travel from place to place, speak in a pleasant and captivating style, find the applause of the audience, and are frequently mentioned in the papers. In the meantime the scientific giants are hidden in some lonely laboratory or observatory, engaged in quiet research, or in writing books which, owing to their very solidity and depth, do not appeal to, nor are understood by the public. It is a well-known fact that the greatest scholars frequently are of a shy and reserved disposition, hate to appear in large crowds, and often lack the attractive power of speech which the popular lecturer possesses. Thus it happens that the utterances of the latter are taken by the people as the opinions of the scientific world. If you have a pond full of delicious fish, and put a few frogs in it, the next evening one will get the impression that the whole pond is full of frogs, and nothing else. The loud croakers are heard and the silent fish not as much as thought of.

One thing seems to be established; namely, that no argument against the Christian religion can be drawn from the supposed agreement of the scientists. Such an agreement does not exist.

On the contrary, the great leaders in all branches are to a great extent defenders of Christianity, or certainly not its opponents. What a splendid galaxy of Christian luminaries we have been admiring! In particular, what a consolation to the Catholic to find among the greatest a respectable number of loyal children of the Church: Volta, Ampère, d'Omalius, Johannes Müller, Chevreul, Fuchs, Dumas, Cauchy, Pasteur, Fraunhofer, and others, and such great scholars among the clergy as Piazzi and Secchi, Vico and Perry, Hauy and Carnoy. These names prove also that the "inferiority" of Catholics and the hostility of the Church to natural science exist only in the imagination of the enemies of the Church.

R. SCHWICKERATH, S.J.

Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.

SLAV CATHOLICS IN THE UNITED STATES.

I.

DIFFICULTIES AND OBJECTIONS.

THE phenomenal growth, within a few years, of the Slav population in the United States has aroused no slight anxiety among educators and religious reformers, not all of whom are in sympathy with Catholic principles and methods. Dr. Frank Julian Warne, who has studied the Slav situation in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania, where exceptional opportunities are offered for observing the habits of the immigrants from Hungary and Poland, and for noting the effects which their settlement in large numbers has upon native conditions, tells us that whilst, as a result of the Slav invasion, "Protestantism is weak and declining, the Catholicism introduced by these immigrants is not fruitful of the best results." Apart from the fact that they speak a foreign language, the complaints aroused by their religious prepossessions are: first, that they observe an unnecessarily large number of religious holidays. This is an objection which was made by the representatives of the coal operators before the Strike Commission. Secondly, that they introduce the continental (European) Sunday, which means that they do not observe the traditional quiet which is one of the desirable inheritances left us as a

nation by the Puritan Fathers. A third objection is against the parochial school as a means of perpetuating the foreign language to the exclusion of English, thus preventing the efficient training in good citizenship which follows upon familiarity with the language and spirit of our laws and of our national customs. This last difficulty is worthy of special notice, for it furnishes argument to the advocates of compulsory education (in state schools without religion), which, if it were to gain ground, would be a serious calamity for our children, inasmuch as it would enforce exclusively intellectual training at the expense of moral education. We quote Dr. Warne's words:

"Another feature this growth of Catholicism is emphasizing is the educational training that is being given to many of the children of its adherents. This is in the parochial school. The writer has no criticism to make of the value of the parochial school from a religious standpoint. He believes, however, that the parochial school among the Slavs in the anthracite region does not take the place of the public school system for training American citizens out of Slav children. Only one illustration of this is necessary. I am told on the very best authority—by a citizen of one of the towns where two parochial schools are now located, and a man whose only object is to make known the truth—that the English language is not taught in these schools. This statement was made by my informant, despite the fact that he knew reports are made to the contrary by officials whose duty it is to investigate the matter. When it is borne in mind that these Slav children are, in all probability, destined to live in communities where English is the language of communication, it can at once be seen how grievous an injury is being done, not only to them in their being kept in ignorance of a valuable asset in life's work, but to the anthracite communities, a correct knowledge of whose institutions can only be gained through the English tongue."—*Public Ledger*, Philadelphia, October 7, 1903.

These objections against the Catholic Slav immigrants, whatever the motives of those who bring them forward, reflect upon the Catholic Church and those who represent her, and it would be poor wisdom as well as bad policy not to attach any weight to them simply because they are exaggerated or show a certain bias.

As to the number of religious holidays which these immigrants observe, it ought to strike any reasonable critic that these Catholics represent a very much larger right of individual liberty than their employers, and that to argue otherwise is to hold that public industries are for the benefit of the employer to the exclusion of the laborer's rights and privileges. If we regard this population of men who claim the right of naturalization, as citizens and not

as serfs, we must co ncede to them the liberty of fixing their religious holidays, even if their employers dislike it. These holidays are not so many; no more than six or seven at the most; and in view of the constant agitation of our philanthropic labor leaders to shorten the hours of labor and to give the workingman more days of leisure, it seems a little absurd to complain of men who vindicate their right to holidays that have a religious sanction, and which if properly observed can but tend to better the moral and social condition of the laborer, and thus benefit the community.

With regard to the way in which these holidays and Sundays are observed, we need indeed be solicitous about keeping the continental customs out of the land. And here those of us who are called to coöperate in the work of the Church will find opportunity for directing and safeguarding the people that follow their allegiance.

What is actually being done in the parochial schools toward Americanizing the children of foreign-born parents, who wish to preserve their religion for their offspring as well as for themselves, can hardly be justly estimated by any local scrutiny. It is probably true that in many Slav schools English is still regarded as a secondary medium or object of instruction; and this condition is simply the result of present necessity, and one which, it may be confidently assumed, is not at all likely to continue very long. American teachers who know both the Slav and the English languages sufficiently well to teach both, are not easily obtained. The language most needed to give the children religious instruction with which the parents can sympathize is the Slavic. The teachers capable of imparting religious education—for the most part, members of religious orders—have to be brought from the home country. It will take some time before they can train novices taken from American soil and who know English, as candidates for the new schools. That this will be quickly done is certain. In the meantime there is no great danger of the children remaining ignorant of the English language because they are not getting the rules of English etymology and syntax; they will learn the language in the highway before their parents and teachers have been able to teach them all they know in the Slav tongue.

It may be here that we might find a legitimate apprehension regarding the religious training of these Slav children. Their parents are not in position to transmit to them a school education which takes sufficient account of their religious growth, partly because they are bound to toil for a living most of their day, and partly because they do not possess the pedagogical faculty which an all-sided education demands from an instructor. The children of our Slav population, if their religion is to be preserved to them, must therefore be assigned to the care of teachers who know their language, and who have their faith. How to get these is the great question and the great difficulty. It may be said that there are religious communities enough in the old country to supply the needs of the new. Probably so. But these religious communities, having their roots in a country where they are contented because protected, are not easily disposed to transplant into a new region, of which they know little or nothing, where they are not sure of a subsistence without certain risks, and, above all, where the isolation of their novel condition in small groups presents a danger of disintegration, or at least of lax discipline, which would mean a destruction of their very constitution. It is just as difficult to obtain good religious as it is to obtain priests who are willing to make the sacrifice of a secure position and to take up the unorganized and uncertain work of religious ministration in a foreign land.

There are many things that are apt to create a sense of warning in religious superiors who might be otherwise well disposed to transfer the activity of their communities. Where extraordinary missionary zeal moves them to the step, they face deliberately the idea of possible failure or martyrdom. But in all other cases the condition is different. They are unfamiliar with the territory. They lack the funds to come over and establish themselves. They do not know how far they may count upon the protection of the authorities; for the bishops can only in rare cases at once instal them in convents, assign them to definite work, or provide them with a fixed stipend or sustenance; they are often unable to guarantee them even a priest to minister to their spiritual necessities. Under these circumstances no one will deem it imprudent on the part of superiors of religious teaching communities in the old land if they hesitate to come here.

Yet something ought to be done to save the children of our Slav immigrants, who, however firmly grounded their parents may be in the ancient faith, are sure to be lost to the Church—and this means to that sturdy American citizenship which recognizes morality and obedience to authority as a duty of conscience.

The practical question to which an answer is due is: What *can* be done under the circumstances? Assuming that we, as American citizens and fellows of the Slav immigrants, realize our interest and obligation in the matter, the first step that suggests itself would seem to be toward *definite organization.* This implies the necessity of a careful study, first, of the *situation as it is;* second, of *the needs* in various departments of education, religion, and common citizenship; third, of *the resources* that are actually available to meet these needs at present; and, lastly, of the *measures to be taken* in order to *secure the future* organization of educational and religious institutions by which the Slav population will retain its faith and become a helpful element to the healthy growth of the American commonwealth.

A few suggestions contributing to the solution of the problem along these lines may not be amiss here.

II.

The Practical Aspect.

The Slav population, it must be remembered, is a composite stock, consisting of half a dozen or more different national divisions, each of which has a different language and separate traditions that go back in some cases to an independence established more than a thousand years ago, when they began to emanate from the Carpathian region in various directions. Roughly speaking, we meet in the United States Poles and Lithuanians, Slovaks and Czechs (Bohemian), Croats and Slovenes (Illyria), and distinct from these the Magyars, a race in many ways superior among the inhabitants of Hungary, who maintain a sense of ancient dignity as conquerors of some of the earliest Slav tribes.

Not a few of these classes speak several languages which have a dialectical affinity; many of them, too, speak German, having been educated in German schools or having served in the armies of Aus-

tria or Prussia under whose jurisdiction they were politically. The same is of course true of the priests who minister to them. It was to be expected that some of these have taken for granted that freedom in the United States meant also independence from ecclesiastical as well as civil authorities, especially when they found that these did not understand their difficulties and could not therefore sympathize with them owing to a total ignorance of their language and antecedents. This fact is noteworthy not only because it has led to the establishment of so-called *independent* churches in which priests of the Latin jurisdiction administer the sacraments without having faculties from legitimate authority to do so, but more especially because it furnishes a key to the restlessness and contentions with which the Slav congregations are in many instances credited. In some cases there have been no pastors, and the people feeling the importance of their numbers and their needs, have undertaken to build themselves churches, believing that once they had these it would be easy to find priests to serve them. When the bishop did not or could not promptly provide them priests of their own nationality, even on condition that these were well supported, some of the congregations undertook to invite priests from various parts to accept the charge, offering them a good living and promise of loyal allegiance. Under this system a great deal of mischief has been done. Priests have gone from one diocese to another, abandoning their charges under the plea that they could not get on peaceably with their congregations, or that they were not properly supported. The ecclesiastical authorities were in many cases actually unable to verify the financial conditions of such parishes, or to restore peace between the pastor and his flock, and thus deemed it the briefest way out of trouble to let things take their course. What did they want with a priest whom they could not trust, who only caused anxiety because he had become discontented, and who was disliked by his people because he had his eye on another congregation?

One result of this state of things was that the Slav congregations in many instances held fast the titles of their churches, refusing to give up these even to the bishops, who could not satisfy them by providing them with priests and teachers.

A second obstacle to good administration, and closely connected with the first, has been the fact that the priests of the Slav congregations can be with difficulty brought to give an exact account of their financial responsibilities. Whether or not the people under a system of self-elected trustees hold the titles of the church property, the pastor frequently receives as his own all that he can get from the people by way of salary, stipend, or perquisite. And here the odious custom of payments made on occasion of administration of the sacraments, including confession, is in many places a scandal to all who are not able to understand the motives that prompt such a system. Here, too, the *trustees* of the churches have their function, supplying tickets which entitle the holder to go to the sacraments after having paid his dues.

A third difficulty of managing the religious affairs of the Slav people results from the mutual opposition of certain elements among them. Thus the Magyar and the Slovac are, it is generally understood, unable to agree in public affairs, which means that they will not minister in the same churches, send their children to the same schools, even when it is unquestionable that they receive proper priestly ministrations from a pastor who understands the languages of both nationalities (which differ considerably).

The crucial point of all the difficulties combined is this, that it neutralizes the authority of our Bishops. It is true, the Ordinary may use his powers, and suspend the priest whom he finds abetting opposition or ignoring the general and diocesan canons, and he may place the people practically under interdict; but any one who knows the Slavs, at least the bulk of them, will be persuaded how futile and dangerous these measures are as a rule with a population whose temper, apart from many excellent qualities of disposition, is fiery, independent, resentful as a result of long oppression, and who to these natural elements of resistance join an inability from their very condition to realize what they are doing when they ignore or defy authority as represented by the ecclesiastical head, who, they think, belongs to another race that never troubles itself about them and cannot understand them.

All this applies likewise to that part of our population which professes the Greek rite, many of whom are Slavs. It is said that

of these there are already in the United States some 300,000. In their case one more difficulty is added in the differences of their liturgy, which separate them from their brethren of the Latin rite. These Catholics are as a rule possessed of a good religious spirit; they will make sacrifices for their faith, which is the best test of practical religion; they are united to and devoted to the Holy See. But it is easy to see that in the absence of priestly and episcopal supervision they will be drawn toward the schismatic church which offers every inducement to allegiance in language, temper and race interests, and hence in time must alienate them from their traditional fidelity and belief. The Russian Church, it may be said, makes every effort to gain over these Uniates to the schismatic church, and from political as well as religious motives supports most of its Greek churches in this country. The only offset to the propaganda resulting from support by the Russian Synod is the silent subsidy to the Magyar element by the Hungarian Government, which thus hopes to counteract the tendency toward Panslavism, that is, the union of the Slavs, now under Austrian rule, with those of Russia. The difficulty arising from the fact that some of the Greek clergy are married touches a delicate problem which we see no way of solving under present legislation.

Such are the difficulties in the main, as they present themselves to an outside observer in sympathy with Catholic progress. We do not pretend to have seized upon all the telling elements which call for attention in this vital question, nor have we perhaps gauged quite accurately the influences at work in the various fields in which the matter must be agitated; but before we discuss the remedies that suggest themselves, which we hope to do in another article on this subject, we should be glad to have those who must needs be well informed give us the benefit of their suggestion or correction. As regards the Greek or Oriental Church, we take occasion here to direct attention to the admirable work done by the present Bishop of Harrisburg, Dr. John W. Shanahan, who in a very clear and concise way has brought together the authoritative expressions of the Holy See on this very complicated topic of the Eastern Churches.[1]

THE EDITOR.

(To be continued.)

[1] *The Holy See and the Oriental Churches.*

"BLESSED ARE THE DEAD."

RESPECT for the dead is not an exclusively Christian sentiment. It has its springs in human nature and gushes forth in various forms and currents at different times and places. But whether we trace it in the oblations and grave-gifts that have propitiated and accompanied the departed, or in the embalming of the dead which was extensively practised, or in the magnificent monuments which in many countries have been raised to their memory, we shall on analysis find among its constituent elements an instinctive feeling of man's common humanity, an emotion of pity for a lifeless fellow-creature, a sense of piety and affection for one's own, and above all an apprehension of another world, an insuppressible thought that there is an invisible hereafter where the dead still live, still claim our remembrance, still need our solicitude and our help. But it is Christianity that has strengthened, transformed and elevated these deep-seated sentiments of our common nature. They are no longer vague and uncertain; they are sustained and sanctioned by revealed truth, and in particular they rest upon the central dogma of our faith, the resurrection of the dead. The dead body will come to life again. Nay, it is not dead, but sleepeth. It is only buried—typically, no less than really, laid in a narrow "cell," in a place of "rest," "in a hostelry," to await the angel's trumpet call at the end of time.

Then will death be swallowed up in victory. Then will the mortal corruptible body, the partner of the soul, the temple of God, cleansed and purified by a hundred rites and sacraments, be invested with incorruption and immortality. As the seed that is sown—the grain of wheat that is buried in the ground—first dies and then bursts into life again, so the human body is sown in dishonor, in weakness, in putrescence, but it will rise hereafter beautiful, strong, and imperishable.

Influenced by these two considerations, namely, the sacred character of man's body and its future resurrection, the Catholic Church has always treated her departed children with special respect and consideration, and has never, except in exceptional circumstances, tolerated the revolting practice of cremation—a practice which, borrowed from the Greeks by the Romans, was not

repugnant to a pagan people, many of whom, as St. Paul tells us, were devoid of natural affection and made a degrading use of their bodies. For two thousand years the discipline of the Christian religion has insisted on the burial of the dead, that as the Master was laid in the tomb from which He gloriously arose, so may it be with the children who are like Him and have fallen asleep in His name. The Catholic funeral service is so allied and intertwined with this discipline that it would lose much of its force and appositeness—would in fact need to be remodelled—were a different method of bestowing the dead to be introduced. According to the Roman Ritual, the corpse is to be borne to the church, it is to be sprinkled with holy water and incensed, Mass is to be said in its presence, the creed of holy Job is to be solemnly chanted—"I believe that my Redeemer liveth and that on the last day I shall arise out of the earth and in my flesh behold my Saviour," a funeral procession is to be formed to the grave, and as the coffin is lowered—*in actu depositionis*—the hope-inspiring words of Christ, as he stood in tears with Mary and Martha beside the fœtid corpse of their brother, are to be sung or recited: "I am the Resurrection and the Life. He that believeth in me, although he be dead, shall live. And he that liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

As we search out in detail the directions of the Ritual we shall be more and more struck with the affectionate care and the minute services with which the Church follows those who die within her fold from the moment of death to the parting *Requiescat.*

First of all, Christians are warned to continue the prayers for a soul in agony till death has certainly taken place, and, though it is not easy to determine the exact moment when the vital spark quits the human frame, yet most people are familiar with the ordinary symptoms which notify the severance of soul and body. The pulse ceases to beat, the rapid breathing or deep-drawn sighs come to an end, the features shrink, the lips become dry and far apart, a damp chill spreads over the forehead, and the dusky grey of the face is interspersed with green or livid patches. But as in acute diseases all apparent movement often ceases an hour before death, and as the action of the vital organs grows almost imper-

ceptible, in a manner resembling what occurs in catalepsy and hibernation, there should never be an abrupt transition to the prayers for the dead, and a brief interval should be allowed to elapse after death before the body is moved and laid out. As soon, however, as the end is practically certain, the priest or in his unavoidable absence some one of those present should read the touching *Subvenite* of the Ritual:

> Come all ye Saints of God
> And ye angels draw nigh, to receive this soul,
> To present it in the sight of God, Most High.
>
> Go on thy course;
> And may thy place to-day be found in peace,
> And may thy dwelling be the Holy Mount
> Of Sion;—in the name of Christ our Lord.[1]

At the conclusion of the foregoing responsory, the eyes and mouth of the departed should be closed, and the body becomingly laid out in a cool, well-ventilated room, in accordance with the directions of the Ritual. The hands are joined on the breast and a cross is placed in them. Clerics are dressed in vestments appropriate to their rank in the ministry, and lay people are usually laid out in a brown habit or in some other way suggested by local custom. Candles are lighted in the room as a symbol of the soul, the heavenly flame that never dies, and of the light of glory that awaits the body in the future. Martinucci recommends that holy water with an aspersory be left in the room, so that the remains may be occasionally sprinkled, first to keep us in mind of the cleansing and purifying process which may retard the soul in its passage to God, and secondly to secure those favors for which the Church petitions when she blesses holy water. "Wherever this sacred spray is sprinkled, may all uncleanness depart and no breath of defilement linger." It seems to be the wish of the Ritual that continual intercession should be kept up for the departed spirit either in the corpse-house or in the church. Hence the Rosary or other prayers should be repeated from time to time, if not in presence of the dead, as is usual, at least in a neighboring room, and the priest should exert his influence to prevent anything unseemly or extravagant during the

[1] *Dream of Gerontius.*

wake and funeral. The excesses that have sometimes disgraced the obsequies of the dead are very different in spirit and character from laudable customs, such as funeral feasts and almsgiving, which were inculcated and practised in former times. "I tell you," says St. Chrysostom, "another way of honoring the dead besides costly grave garments . . . namely, the vesture of almsgiving, a vesture that will arise with the dead." "Other husbands," says St. Jerome, "scatter over the tombs of their wives violets, roses, lilies, and purple flowers, and solace their heart's pain by their offices. Our Pammachius waters the holy ashes and venerable bones with the balsam of alms." Of the same Pammachius we read elsewhere that he gave a funeral feast on the death of his wife to the poor of Rome in one of the churches. The motive of these early practices was not merely to benefit the living, but especially to help the dead, that, as St. Chrysostom puts it, they may come to rest and may be clothed with an increase of glory. It is the same motive that prompts every thoughtful Christian, in the presence of death, to abstain from all ostentation, and following the suggestion of St. Jerome, to prefer pious offerings and profitable alms to vain displays and wasteful floral pomp. Pride of life is in strange contrast with gloom and sorrow; flowers are out of harmony with the wish and spirit of the Catholic service. That service is sad and mournful and from beginning to end keeps before the startled imagination "dies irae, dies illa," "dies magna et amara valde."

> When from Heaven the Judge descendeth,
> On whose sentence all dependeth!

Hence the altars are bare; the church is draped in solemn suits of black; the bells are slowly and mournfully tolled, and unceasing intercession ascends from the depths of lowly hearts for the departed. Only in the case of children under seven does the Church put away all the trappings of woe, for their death is always precious, their glory immediate. The bells, if rung at all, pour out a festive peal; one wreath of flowers or of sweet-smelling plants bedecks their innocence and their virginal integrity, and the psalms and service are of a bright and joyful character.

In Catholic countries the remains are usually brought to the

church before interment. Such is the direction of the Ritual. And what can be more appropriate than to restore the Christian pilgrim to the bosom of his pious Mother, the Church, and to send him forth on his final journey from the very portal and vestibule of Heaven, where he has been often nourished with the double Bread that came down from Heaven? What more in accord with the venerable practice of antiquity, such as Augustine tells us was observed in case of his own mother, than that the Sacred Memorial of Christ's Death should be offered up in the presence and for the benefit of the departed spirit? And if we examine the solemn Requiem rites and observe how they arouse and enthrall the faculties, what can be conceived more appealing or richer in dramatic power? Even Carlyle, as he moved through the lofty aisles of the Ghent Cathedral during a service for the dead, was arrested by the loud and not unmelodious chanting of priest and singers, reverberating from the vast roof and walls, in various notes of the gamut, from clamorous, eager petitioning down to the depths of awe or acquiescence, and was forced to admit that he had witnessed few things more genuine or impressive.

The imagination is caught up by the music and solemn surroundings of the occasion and spell-bound by the final struggle that is pictured for it—the tears and terrors of the guilty, the advent of the awful Judge:

> That day of wrath, that dreadful day,
> When heaven and earth shall pass away,
> What power shall be the sinner's stay?
> How shall he meet that dreadful day?
>
> Oh, on that day, that wrathful day,
> When man to Judgment wakes from clay,
> Be Thou the trembling sinner's stay,
> Though heaven and earth shall pass away.

Those verses of Scott are an echo of that majestic sequence described as "a masterpiece of Sacred Song," which, by its words, its metre, its assonance, pierces the very vitals of the soul, appals it with awe, calms it with trust in the gentle Jesus, and bends it low with deep contrition. The same simple earnestness pervades the entire Requiem service—no apotheosis of the departed, no fear of annihilation, but prayers and oblations for mercy. The dead are aided, the living edified. The tapers and incense that honor the former are unto the latter symbols of the light and fra-

grance of Christ; the petitions that mount to heaven for those who have gone before, are for those who linger behind the noblest exercise of faith, hope and charity, of faith in life eternal, of hope in God's mercy, and of charity for the prisoners of the King. Is it not, therefore, the duty of the clergy, the ministers of the Liturgy, to carry out with manifest and unmistakable reverence and earnestness the solemn obsequies of the dead? Do not those obsequies, when performed becomingly and with piety, produce an ever-deepening sense of religion, pour a ray of comfort through the clouds of sorrow, strengthen the bonds of Christian fellowship, and enlarge the communion of the Saints?

The funeral procession to the cemetery either from the church or the house of mourning will vary in its character with local customs and with varying circumstances. Sometimes the distance to be travelled is inconsiderable, and then we may behold an exact fulfilment of the Apostolic Canon which says, "In the going forth of those who have fallen asleep, conduct them with singing of psalms if they are faithful in the Lord, for precious in His sight is the death of the Saints," and of the early Christian tradition according to which lights and incense as well as the chanting of hymns and psalms accompanied the body to the grave. The gladsome *In Paradisum*—"May the Angels conduct thee into Paradise"—is sung, the penitential *Miserere* is recited, the grave blessed, the body incensed and sprinkled with holy water, and the beautiful *Benedictus* sung or said:

Eternal rest grant to him, O Lord;
And perpetual light shine on him.
May he rest in peace.
So may it be!

We may mention incidentally a very ancient custom to be met with in some places in accordance with which the priest throws some clay three distinct times on the body in the grave, saying "Remember, man, thou art but dust and unto dust thou shalt return," and then invites all to recite three Our Fathers, one for the deceased, one for all in the cemetery, and one for the person present who will die next.

The various prayers and psalms and canticles that enter into the obsequies of the dead are either entirely Scriptural or full of Scriptural allusions and have been handed down from the earliest

times by the most ancient Sacramentaries. Formerly, when the general public, not to speak of cultured society, were fairly familiar with ecclesiastical Latin, the funeral dirge always produced a salutary effect on those who heard it. But nowadays laymen and sometimes even clerics never experience those profound emotions which it is calculated to awaken. Laymen in fact have been heard to complain that they are more touched by a non-Catholic service, which they can follow, than by their own which is unintelligible to them. Hence in many places a laudable custom has been introduced of adding some prayers in English or other vernacular as well as in Latin. But there is room for a further advance and for a greater effort to unfold to our people the manifold beauties of the Requiem service and to place it in their hands and familiarize them with it in the best possible English vesture. Then will it appeal to them, then will it reach their hearts, made receptive by the presence of death and the dread uncertainty of life; then will those words of Job lay hold of them:

"Man, born of woman, is of few days and full of woe; cometh forth as a flower and is cut down; fleeth as a shadow and never continues in the same state. In the bitterness of his soul will he speak and say unto his God—'Condemn me not. Blot out my transgressions. O God, remember not my sins. Deliver me from eternal death.'"

I dread my sins, I blush before Thee—
I see the Great Tribunal set!
In fear and terror I behold Thee,
Forgive when soul and Judge are met.

We have not referred to what is sometimes described as the funeral oration. No doubt, there are great occasions when such an addition to the obsequies may be appropriate and even deserved. But ordinarily anything in the nature of panegyric—anything more than a few simple words—will be out of place. And even a few words at such a time require to be chosen with care and discretion, for it would be easy by want of sympathy no less than by ill-timed praise to offend some and scandalize others. Cardinal Gibbons[2] tells us that "those funeral discourses often make a salutary impression on our separated brethren as well as on the members of our own flock," and that "not a few devoted

[2] *The Ambassador of Christ.*

converts can trace the first dawning of spiritual truth on their heart to the apposite explanation of the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory." That doctrine, with its corollary of prayer for the departed, commends itself in the hour of affliction "to their yearnings, their sympathies, their reason, and their religious sense."

Besides the two subjects thus recommended—the sweet reasonableness of an intermediate state and of prayers for those who linger there—there are many others that are naturally suggested by the following quotations from the office of the dead:

"The Hand of the Lord hath touched me."

"As I sin daily and repent not, the fear of death troubleth me."

"The days of man are few, the number of his months is with Thee."

"Thou dost visit him early, and dost try him suddenly."

"If a man die, shall he live again?"

"I believe that I shall see the good things of the Lord in the land of the living."

"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord."

The distinctive title for the Christian burial-ground is *cemetery*. This Greek word, with its natural meaning of a sleeping apartment, was invested by the early Christians, probably at Alexandria, with a novel and striking significance—the resting-place of the faithful departed, because, as St. Jerome says, "with them death is not death, but merely a sleep"—a sleep to be followed by a glorious awakening. From the very beginning the Christian communities, abhorring, like the Jews, all admixture in death as well as in life with the heathen, managed to have burial places for themselves apart from the Gentile *columbaria*, where cremated remains were deposited in urns. They were enabled to accomplish this coveted separation by the legislation of the time. For, by the laws of the Roman Empire, burial spaces were always outside the walls of a city, and were invested with a religious character which extended, not only to the open spaces, but even to subterranean vaults, such as the Catacombs, and to all appurtenances, such as memorial buildings and chapels, connected with those spaces. In this way the Church, in her corporate capacity, acting however through legalized funeral guilds, or *collegia*, was able, even during the stress of persecution, to provide suitable cemeteries for her children. After the fourth century, the prac-

tice of building churches at the tombs of martyrs, and of transferring their relics to basilicas, gradually led to burials within the city walls, and even within the precincts of churches. But we know from various Councils that the Church has rarely more than tolerated this departure from ancient usage, and has at times even condemned the unbecoming and unsanitary introduction of the dead into the Holy House of God and of His Saints. Hence the Ritual prescribes: "Let the ancient custom of burying the dead in a cemetery be retained where it exists, and be restored where possible." The Ritual adds other directions with reference to the home of the departed. It should be consecrated or blessed; a cross should stand in the centre; inept epitaphs should be excluded; separate and suitable plots should be marked off for baptized infants and for the clergy, and a distinct and separate space for those who are not admitted to ecclesiastical sepulture. If the cemetery is kept becomingly, ornamented with yew trees or other suitable shrubs, and brightened with flowers, it will not be difficult for the priest to induce the people to remember their departed friends, and to make an occasional visit to their last resting-place, and offer an occasional prayer for their repose.

> Their names, their years spelt by the unlettered muse
> The place of fame and elegy supply,
> And many a holy text around she strews
> That teach the rustic moralist to die.

The Catholic Church has been always solicitous to preserve inviolate the sacred character of the cemetery, and should it ever happen to become the scene of any disgraceful and defiling occurrence such as wilful murder, it ceases to be regarded or used as holy ground without a fresh religious consecration or dedication. Moreover, ecclesiastical sepulture is a privilege of restricted extension. Those only are entitled to it who die in union and friendship with the Catholic Church, and whenever, as in Montreal about thirty years ago, the rights of the Church are invaded and a burial enforced against her wishes, the polluted space is placed under interdict and shunned by all Catholics, and the whole cemetery is purified from the defilement. People who criticise such procedure and the Church's antipathy to indiscriminate burial forget that every community is governed by its own laws and traditions and that the invariable principle and tradition of the

Catholic Church has been to exclude non-Catholics and unworthy Catholics from the honors of ecclesiastical sepulture, namely, burial in consecrated ground and with religious rites and suffrages. Surely it would be inconsistent and scandalous for a Christian organization to signalize with honors the memory of an opponent who derided its claims or of an adherent who flouted its principles. At the same time the common rules of charity run counter to all the dangers of harshness and of scandal in the denial of ecclesiastical burial. Hence such denial is not allowable, especially in these times when civil funerals and promiscuous burial are on the increase, unless the unworthiness of an individual—his apostasy or suicide or concubinage or encouragement of cremation or evil life—has been certain and public and persisted in to the very end; hence, too, it will be rarely advisable for a priest to give a definite refusal, especially in doubtful cases, without first consulting the bishop. As already hinted, the Church prohibits and detests cremation[3]—not as intrinsically wrong, seeing that she sometimes tolerates and sometimes allows it, but as opposed to Christian usage and as patronized by Freemasons and atheists. Consequently she will neither administer the last Sacraments nor grant Christian burial to those who before dying have with deliberate disregard of her wishes, ordered their bodies to be cremated.

In conclusion let us give an instance from the United States of the mildness with which the Catholic Church tempers her principles and laws in this matter. The prelates of the First Synod of Baltimore prohibited ecclesiastical obsequies in the case of those Catholics whose bodies were to be interred without any reasonable cause in non-Catholic graveyards, the motive of the prelates being, as we know, their solicitude, as it is the desire of the Church, to see the faithful departed always laid at rest in consecrated ground. The Third Synod has however mitigated the severity of the First, chiefly on account of the frequency of conversions, and it is now lawful, if the bishop of the diocese interposes no objection, to celebrate the entire Requiem service, both Office and Mass, either at the church or the corpse-house, in the case of those who are buried in a family vault or tomb in a non-Catholic cemetery. C. M.

[3] The violent process of reducing a corpse to a few pounds of ashes in a couple of hours.

Analecta.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI DIVINA PROVIDENTIA

PII PAPAE X

EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA

AD PATRIARCHAS PRIMATES ARCHIEPISCOPOS EPISCOPOS ALIOSQUE LOCORUM ORDINARIOS PACEM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTES

Venerabilibus Fratribus Patriarchis Primatibus Archiepiscopis Episcopis Aliisque Locorum Ordinariis Pacem et Communionem cum Apostolica Sede Habentibus

PIUS PP. X

VENERABILES FRATRES

SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM

E supremi apostolatus cathedra, ad quam, consilio Dei inscrutabili, evecti fuimus, vobis primum eloquuturos, nihil attinet commemorare quibus Nos lacrymis magnisque precibus formidolosum hoc Pontificatus onus depellere a Nobis conati simus. Videmur equidem Nobis, etsi omnino meritis impares, convertere in rem

Nostram posse quae Anselmus, vir sanctissimus, querebatur quum, adversans et repugnans, coactus est honorem episcopatus suscipere. Etenim quae ille moeroris indicia pro se afferebat, eadem et Nobis proferre licet, ut ostendamus quo animo, qua voluntate Christi gregis pascendi gravissimum officii munus exceperimus. *Testantur*, sic ille,[1] *lacrymae meae et voces et rugitus a gemitu cordis mei, quales nunquam de me, ullo dolore, memini exiisse ante diem illam, in qua sors illa gravis archiepiscopatus Cantuariae visa est super me cedidisse. Quod ignorare nequiverunt illi qui, ea die, vultum meum inspexerunt . . . Ego magis mortuo quam viventi colore similis, stupore et dolore pallebam. Huic autem de me electioni, imo violentiae, hactenus, quantum potui, servata veritate, reluctatus sum. Sed iam, velim nolim, cogor fateri quia quotidie iudicia Dei magis ac magis conatui meo resistunt, ut nullo modo videam me ea posse fugere. Unde iam, non tam hominum quam Dei, contra quam non est prudentia, victus violentiâ, hoc solo intelligo me uti debere consilio, ut, postquam oravi quantum potui, et conatus sum ut, si possibile esset, calix iste transiret a me ne biberem illum . . . meum sensum et voluntatem postponens, me sensui et voluntati Dei penitus committam.*

Nec plane repugnandi causae, multae, et maximae, defuerunt Nobis. Praeterquam enim quod honore pontificatus, ob tenuitatem Nostram, nullo pacto Nos dignaremur; quem non moveret ei se successorem designari, qui, cum ecclesiam sex fere ac viginti annos sapientissime rexisset, tanta valuit alacritate ingenii, tanto virtutum omnium splendore, ut vel adversarios in sui admirationem traduxerit et memoriam sui nominis factis praeclarissimis consecrarit?—Dein, ut praetereamus cetera, terrebat Nos, quam quod maxime, ea quae modo est humani generis conditio afflictissima. Quem enim lateat, consociationem hominum gravissimo nunc, supra praeteritas aetates, atque intimo urgeri morbo; qui in dies ingravescens eamque penitus exedens ad exitium rapit? Morbus qui sit, intelligitis, Venerabiles Fratres; defectio abscessioque a Deo: quo nihil profecto cum pernicie coniunctius, secundum Prophetae dictum: *Quia ecce, qui elongant se a te, peribunt.*[2] Tanto igitur malo, pro pontificali munere quod demandabatur, occurrendum esse Nobis videbamus; arbitrabamur enim Dei

[1] Epp. 1: 3, ep. 1.

[2] Ps. 72: 27.

iussum ad Nos pertinere: *Ecce constitui te hoaie super gentes et super regna, ut evellas et destruas, et aedifices et plantes;*[3] verum conscii Nobis infirmitatis Nostrae, negotium, quod nihil simul haberet morae et difficultatis plurimum, suscipere verebamur.

Attamen, quoniam numini divino placuit humilitatem Nostram ad hanc amplitudinem potestatis provehere; erigimus animum *in eo qui* Nos *confortat*, Deique virtute freti manum operi admoventes, in gerendo pontificatu hoc unum declaramus propositum esse Nobis *instaurare omnia in Christo*,[4] ut videlicet sit *omnia et in omnibus Christus*.[5]—Erunt profecto qui, divina humanis metientes, quae Nostra sit animi mens rimari nitantur atque ad terrenos usus partiumque studia detorquere. His ut inanem spem praecidamus, omni asseveratione affirmamus nihil velle Nos esse, nihil, opitulante Deo, apud consociationem hominum futuros, nisi Dei, cuius utimur auctoritate, administros. Rationes Dei rationes Nostrae sunt; pro quibus vires omnes vitamque ipsam devovere decretum est. Unde si qui symbolum a Nobis expetant, quod voluntatem animi patefaciat; hoc unum dabimus semper: *Instaurare omnia in Christo!*

Quo quidem in praeclaro opere suscipiendo urgendoque illud Nobis, Venerabiles Fratres, alacritatem affert summam, quod certum habemus fore vos omnes strenuos ad perficiendam rem adiutores. Id enim si dubitemus, ignaros vos, non sane iure, aut negligentes putaverimus nefarii illius belli, quod nunc, ferme ubique, commotum est atque alitur adversus Deum. Vere namque in Auctorem suum *fremuerunt gentes et populi meditati sunt inania*;[6] ut communis fere ea vox sit adversantium Deo: *Recede a nobis*.[7] Hinc extincta omnino in plerisque aeterni Dei reverentia, nullaque habita in consuetudine vitae, publice ac privatim, supremi eius numinis ratio; quin totis nervis contenditur omnique artificio, ut vel ipsa recordatio Dei atque notio intereat penitus.

Haec profecto qui reputet, is plane metuat necesse est ne malorum, quae supremo tempore sunt expectanda, sit perversitas haec animorum libamentum quoddam ac veluti exordium; neve *filius perditionis*, de quo Apostolus loquitur,[8] iam in hisce terris

[3] Ierem. 1 : 10.
[4] Ephes. 1 : 10
[5] Coloss. 3 : 11.
[6] Ps. 2 : 1.
[7] Iob, 21 : 14.
[8] II Thess. 2 : 3.

versetur. Tanta scilicet audacia, eo furore religionis pietas ubique impetitur, revelatae fidei documenta oppugnantur, quaeque homini cum Deo officia intercedunt tollere delere prorsus praefracte contenditur! E contra, quae, secundum Apostolum eundem, propria est *Antichristi* nota, homo ipse, temeritate summa, in Dei locum invasit, extollens se *supra omne quod dicitur Deus;* usque adeo ut, quamvis Dei notitiam extinguere penitus in se nequeat, Eius tamen maiestate reiecta, aspectabilem hunc mundum sibi ipse veluti templum dedicaverit a ceteris adorandus. *In templo Dei sedeat, ostendens se tamquam sit Deus.*[9]

Enimvero hoc adversus Deum mortalium certamen qua sorte pugnetur nullus est sanae mentis qui ambigat. Datur quidem homini, libertate sua abutenti, rerum omnium Conditoris ius atque numen violare; verumtamen victoria a Deo semper stat: quin etiam tum propior clades imminet, quum homo, in spe triumphi, insurgit audentior. Haec ipse Deus nos admonet in Scripturis sanctis. *Dissimulat* scilicet *peccata hominum,*[10] suae veluti potentiae ac maiestatis immemor; mox vero, post adumbratos recessus, *excitatus tamquam potens crapulatus a vino,*[11] *confringet capita inimicorum suorum;*[12] ut norint omnes *quoniam rex omnis terrae Deus,*[13] *et sciant gentes quoniam homines sunt.*[14]

Haec quidem, Venerabiles Fratres, fide certa tenemus et expectamus. Attamen non ea impediunt quominus, pro nostra quisque parte, Dei opus maturandum nos etiam curemus: idque, non solum efflagitando assidue: *Exsurge, Domine, non confortetur homo;*[15] verum, quod plus interest, re et verbo, luce palam, supremum in homines ac naturas ceteras Dei dominatum adserendo vindicandoque, ut Eius imperandi ius ac potestas sancte colatur ab omnibus et observetur.—Quod plane non modo officium postulat a natura profectum, verum etiam communis utilitas nostri generis. Quorumnam etenim, Venerabiles Fratres, animos non conficiat trepidatio ac moeror, quum homines videant, partem maximam, dum quidem humanitatis progressus haud immerito extolluntur, ita digladiari atrociter inter se, ut fere sit omnium in omnes pugna?

[9] II Thess. 2: 2.
[10] Sap. 11: 24.
[11] Ps. 77: 65.
[12] Ps. 67: 22.
[13] Ib. 46: 8.
[14] Ib. 9: 20.
[15] Ps. 9: 19.

Cupiditas pacis omnium profecto pectora attingit, eamque nemo est qui non invocet vehementer. Pax tamen, reiecto Numine, absurde quaeritur; unde namque abest Deus, iustitiae exsultat; sublataque iustitia, frustra in spem pacis venitur. *Opus iustitiae pax.*[16]—Novimus equidem non paucos esse, qui studio pacis ducti, *tranquilitatis* nempe *ordinis*, in coetus factionesque coalescunt, quae ab *ordine* nominant. Proh tamen spes curasque inanes! Partes *ordinis*, quae pacem afferre turbatis rebus reapse queant, unae sunt: partes faventium Deo. Has igitur promovere necesse est, ad easque quo licebit plures adducere, si securitatis amore incitamur.

Verum haec ipsa, Venerabiles Fratres, humanarum gentium ad maiestatem Dei imperiumque revocatio, quantumvis licet conemur, numquam nisi per Iesum Christum eveniet. Monet enim Apostolus: *Fundamentum aliud nemo potest ponere praeter id quod positum est, quod est Christus Iesus.*[17] Scilicet unus ipse est, *quem Pater sanctificavit et misit in mundum;*[18] *splendor Patris et figura substantiae eius,*[19] Deus verus verusque homo: sine quo, Deum, ut oportet, agnoscere nemo possit; nam *neque Patrem quis novit nisi Filius, et cui voluerit Filius revelare.*[20]—Ex quo consequitur, ut idem omnino sit *instaurare omnia in Christo* atque homines ad Dei obtemperationem reducere. Huc igitur curas intendamus oportet, ut genus hominum in Christi ditionem redigamus: eo praestito, iam ad ipsum Deum remigraverit. Ad Deum inquimus, non socordem illum atque humana negligentem, quem *materialistarum* deliramenta effinxerunt; sed Deum vivum ac verum, unum natura personis trinum, auctorem mundi, omnia sapientissime providentem, iustissimum denique legislatorem, qui sontes plectat, praemia proposita virtutibus habeat.

Porro qua iter nobis ad Christum pateat, ante oculos est: per Ecclesiam videlicet. Quamobrem iure Chrysostomus: *Spes tua Ecclesia, salus tua Ecclesia, refugium tuum Ecclesia.*[21] In id namque illam condidit Christus, quaesitam sui sanguinis pretio; eique doctrinam suam ac suarum praecepta legum commendavit, amplissima simul impertiens divinae gratiae munera ad sanctitatem ac salutem hominum.

[16] Is. 32: 17.
[17] I Cor. 3: 11.
[18] Io. 10: 36.
[19] Hebr. 1: 3.
[20] Matth. 11: 27.
[21] Hom. *de capto Eutropio*, n. 6.

Videtis igitur, Venerabiles Fratres, quale demum Nobis vobisque pariter officium sit demandatum: ut consociationem hominum, a Christi sapientia aberrantem, ad Ecclesiae disciplinam revocemus; Ecclesia vero Christo subdet, Christus autem Deo. Quod si, Deo ipso favente, perficiemus, iniquitatem cessisse aequitati gratulabimur, audiemusque feliciter *vocem magnam de coelo dicentem: Nunc facta est salus et virtus et regnum Dei nostri et potestas Christi eius.*[22]—Hic tamen ut optatis respondeat exitus, omni ope et opera eniti opus est ut scelus illud immane ac detestabile, aetatis huius proprium, penitus eradamus, quo se nempe homo pro Deo substituit: tum vero leges Evangelii sanctissimae ac consilia in veterem dignitatem vindicanda; adserendae altius veritates ab Ecclesia traditae, quaeque eiusdem sunt documenta de sanctitate coniugii, de educatione doctrinaque puerili, de bonorum possessione atque usu, de officiis in eos qui publicam rem administrant; aequilibritas demum inter varios civitatis ordines christiano instituto ac more restituenda.—Nos profecto haec Nobis, Dei nutui obsequentes, in pontificatu prosequenda proponimus, ac pro virili parte prosequemur. Vestrum autem erit, Venerabiles Fratres, sanctitate, scientia, agendorum usu, studio cum primis divinae gloriae, industriis Nostris obsecundare; nihil aliud spectantes praeterquam ut in omnibus *formetur Christus.*

Iam quibus ad rem tantam utamur adiumentis, vix dicere oportet; sunt enim de medio sumpta.—Curarum haec prima sunto, ut Christum formemus in iis, qui formando in ceteris Christo officio muneris destinantur. Ad sacerdotes mens spectat, Venerabiles Fratres. Sacris namque quotquot initiati sunt, eam in populis, quibuscum versantur, provinciam sibi datam norint, quam Paulus suscepisse testatus est amantissimis iis verbis: *Filioli mei, quos iterum parturio, donec formetur Christus in vobis.*[23] Qui tamen explere munus queant, nisi priores ipsi Christum induerint? atque ita induerint, ut illud Apostoli eiusdem usurpare possint: *Vivo ego, iam non ego, vivit vero in me Christus.*[24] *Mihi vivere Christus est.*[25] Quamobrem, etsi ad fideles omnes pertinet hortatio *ut occurramus in virum perfectum, in mensuram aetatis plenitudinis Christi;*[26] praecipue tamen

[22] Apoc. 12: 10.
[23] Gal. 4.
[24] Gal. 2: 20.
[25] Philipp. 1: 21.
[26] Ephes. 4: 3.

ad illum spectat qui sacerdotio fungitur; qui idcirco dicitur *alter Christus*, non una sane potestatis communicatione sed etiam imitatione factorum, qua expressam in se Christi imaginem praeferat.

Quae cum ita sint, quae vobis quantaque, Venerabiles Fratres, ponenda cura est in clero ad sanctitatem omnem formando! huic, quaecumque obveniant, negotia cedere necesse est. Quamobrem pars potior diligentiarum vestrarum sit de seminariis sacris rite ordinandis moderandisque, ut pariter integritate doctrinae et morum sanctitate floreant. Seminarium cordis quisque vestri delicias habetote, nihil plane ad eius utilitatem omittentes, quod est a Tridentina Synodo providentissime constitutum.—Quum vero ad hoc ventum erit ut candidati sacris initiari debeant, ne quaeso excidat animo quod Paulus Timotheo perscripsit: *Nemini cito manus imposueris;*[27] illud attentissime reputando, tales plerumque fideles futuros, quales fuerint quos sacerdotio destinabitis. Quare ad privatam quancumque utilitatem respectum ne habetote; sed unice spectetis Deum et Ecclesiam et sempiterna animorum commoda, ne videlicet uti Apostolus praecavet, *communicetis peccatis alienis.*[28] —Porro sacerdotes initiati recens atque e seminario digressi industrias vestras ne desiderent. Eos, ex animo hortamur, pectori vestro, quod coelesti igne calere oportet, admovete saepius, incendite, inflammate ut uni Deo et lucris animorum inhiant. Nos equidem, Venerabiles Fratres, diligentissime providebimus ne homines sacri cleri ex insidiis capiantur novae cuiusdam ac fallacis scientiae, quae Christum non redole, quaeque, fucatis astutisque argumentis, *rationalismi* aut *semirationalismi* errores invehere nititur; quos ut caveret iam Apostolus Timotheum monebat, scribens: *Depositum custodi, devitans profanas vocum novitates et oppositiones falsi nominis scientiae, quam quidam promittentes, circa fidem exciderunt.*[29] Hoc tamen non impedimur quo minus laude dignos existimemus illos e sacerdotibus iunioribus, qui utilium doctrinarum studia, in omni sapientiae genere, persequuntur, ut inde ad veritatem tuendam atque osorum fidei calumnias refellendas instructiores fiant. Verumtamen celare haud possumus, quin etiam apertissime profitemur, primas Nos semper delaturos iis qui, quamvis sacras humanasque disciplinas minime praetereunt, proxime nihilosecius

[27] I Tim 5: 22.
[28] Ibid.
[29] I Tim. 6: 20 s.

animorum utilitatibus se dedant, eorum procuratione munerum, quae sacerdotem deceant divinae gloriae studiosum. *Tristitia* Nobis *magna est et continuus dolor cordi* Nostro,[30] quum cadere etiam in aetatem nostram conspicimus Ieremiae lamentationem: *Parvuli petierunt panem, et non erat qui frangeret eis.*[31] Non enim de clero desunt, qui, pro cuiusque ingenio, operam forte navent rebus adumbratae potius quam solidae utilitatis: at verum non adeo multi numerentur qui, ad Christi exemplum, sibi sumant Prophetae dictum: *Spiritus Domini unxit me, evangelizare pauperibus misit me, sanare contritos corde, praedicare captivis remissionem et coecis visum.*[32]—Quem tamen fugiat, Venerabiles Fratres, quum homines ratione maxime ac libertate ducantur, religionis disciplinam potissimam esse viam ad Dei imperium in humanis animis restituendum? Quot plane sunt qui Christum oderunt, qui Ecclesiam, qui Evangelium horrent ignoratione magis quam pravitate animi! de quibus iure dixeris: *quaecumque ignorant blasphemant.*[33] Idque non in plebe solum reperire est aut in infima multitudine, quae ideo in errorem facile trahitur; sed in excultis etiam ordinibus atque adeo in iis, qui haud mediocri eruditione ceteroqui polleant. Hinc porro in plerisque defectus fidei. Non enim dandum est, scientiae progressibus extingui fidem, sed verius inscitia; ut idcirco ubi maior sit ignorantia, ibi etiam latius pateat fidei defectio. Quapropter Apostolis a Christo mandatum est: *Euntes, docete omnes gentes.*[34]

Nunc autem, ut ex docendi munere ac studio fructus pro spe edantur atque in omnibus *formetur Christus*, id penitus in memoria insideat, Venerabiles Fratres, nihil omnino esse caritate efficacius. *Non* enim *in commotione Dominus.*[35] Allici animos ad Deum amariore quodam conatu, speratur perperam: quin etiam errores acerbius increpare, vitia vehementius reprehendere damno magis quam utilitati aliquando est. Timotheum quidem Apostolus hortabatur: *Argue, obsecra, increpa;* attamen addebat: *in omni patientia.*[36] Certe eiusmodi nobis exempla prodidit Christus *Venite*, sic ipsum alloquutum legimus, *venite ad me omnes qui laboratis*

[30] Rom. 9: 2.
[31] Thren. 4: 4.
[32] Luc. 4: 18–19.
[33] Iud. 2: 10.
[34] Matth. 28: 19.
[35] III Reg. 19: 11.
[36] 2 Tim. 4: 2.

et onerati estis, et ego reficiam vos.[37] Laborantes autem oneratosque non alios intelligebat, nisi qui peccato vel errore tenerentur. Quanta enimvero in divino illo magistro mansuetudo! quae suavitas, quae in aerumnosos quoslibet miseratio! Cor eius plane pinxit Isaias iis verbis: *Ponam spiritum meum super eum; non contendet neque clamabit; arundinem quassatam non confringet et linum fumigans non extinguet.*[38] Quae porro caritas, *patiens* et *benigna*[39] ad illos etiam porrigatur necesse est, qui sunt nobis infesti vel nos inimice insectantur. *Maledicimur et benedicimus*, ita de se Paulus profitebatur, *persecutionem patimur et sustinemus, blasphemamur et obsecramus.*[40] Peiores forte quam sunt videntur. Consuetudine enim aliorum, praeiudicatis opinionibus, alienis consiliis et exemplis malesuada demum verecundia in impiorum partem translati sunt: attamen eorum voluntas non adeoest depravata, sicut et ipsi putari gestiunt. Quidni speremus christianae caritatis flammam ab animis caliginem dispulsuram atque allaturam simul Dei lumen et pacem? Tardabitur quandoque forsitan laboris nostri fructus; sed caritas sustentatione nunquam defatigatur, memor non esse praemia a Deo proposita laborum fructibus sed voluntati.

Attamen, Venerabiles Fratres, non ea Nobis mens est ut, in toto hoc opere tam arduo restitutionis humanarum gentium in Christo, nullos vos clerusque vester adiutores habeatis. Scimus mandasse Deum unicuique de proximo suo.[41] Non igitur eos tantum, qui sacris se addixerunt, sed universos prorsus fideles rationibus Dei et animorum adlaborare oportet: non marte utique quemque suo atque ingenio, verum semper Episcoporum ductu atque nutu; praeesse namque, docere, moderari nemini in Ecclesia datur praeter quam vobis, *quos Spiritus Sanctus posuit regere Ecclesiam Dei.*[42] Catholicos homines, vario quidem consilio at semper religionis bono, coire inter se societatem, Decessores Nostri probavere iamdiu bonaque precatione sanxerunt. Institutum porro egregium Nos etiam laudatione Nostra ornare non dubitamus, optamusque vehementer ut urbibus agrisque late inferatur ac floreat. Verumenimvero consociationes eiusmodi eo primo ac potissimum spectare volumus, ut quotquot in illas cooptantur

[37] Matt. 11: 28.
[38] Is. 42: 1 s.
[39] I Cor. 13: 4.
[40] *Ibid.* 4: 12 s.
[41] Eccli. 17: 12.
[42] Act. 20: 28.

christiano more constanter vivant. Parum profecto interest quaestiones multas subtiliter agitari, deque iuribus et officiis eloquenter disseri, ubi haec ab actione fuerint seiugata. Postulant enim actionem tempora; sed eam quae tota sit in divinis legibus atque Ecclesiae praescriptis sancte integreque servandis, in religione libere aperteque profitenda, in omnigenae demum caritatis operibus exercendis, nullo sui aut terrenarum utilitatum respectu. Illustria eiusmodi tot Christi militum exempla longe magis valitura sunt ad commovendos animos rapiendosque quam verba exquisitaeque disceptationes; fietque facile ut, abiecto metu, depulsis praeiudiciis ac dubitationibus, quamplurimi ad Christum traducantur provehantque ubique notitiam eius et amorem; quae ad germanam solidamque beatitatem sunt via. Profecto si in urbibus, si in pagis quibusvis praecepta Dei tenebuntur fideliter, si sacris erit honos, si frequens sacramentorum usus, si cetera custodientur quae ad christianae vitae rationem pertinent; nihil admodum, Venerabiles Fratres, elaborandum erit ulterius ut omnia in Christo instaurentur. Neque haec solum coelestium bonorum prosequutionem spectare existimentur: iuvabunt etiam, quam quae maxime, ad huius aevi publicasque civitatum utilitates. His namque obtentis, optimates ac locupletes aequitate simul et caritate tenuioribus aderunt, hi vero afflictioris fortunae angustias sedate ac patienter ferent; cives non cupiditati sed legibus parebunt; principes et quotquot rempublicam gerunt, quorum *non est potestas nisi a Deo*,[43] vereri ac diligere sanctum erit. Quid plura? Tunc demum omnibus persuasum fuerit debere Ecclesiam, prouti ab auctore Christo est condita, plena integraque libertate frui nec alienae dominationi subiici; Nosque, in hac ipsa libertate vindicanda, non religionis modo sanctissima tueri iura, verum etiam communi populorum bono ac securitati prospicere. Scilicet *pietas ad omnia utilis est:*[44] eaque incolumi ac vigente, *sedebit* reapse *populus in plenitudine pacis.*[45]

Deus, *qui dives est in misericordia*,[46] hanc humanarum gentium in Christo Iesu instaurationem benignus, festinet; *non* enim *volentis* opus *neque currentis sed miserentis est Dei.*[47] Nos vero, Venera-

[43] Rom. 13: 1.
[44] I Tim. 4; 8.
[45] Is. 32: 18.
[46] Ephes. 2: 4.
[47] Rom. 9: 16.

biles Fratres, *in spiritu humilitatis*,[48] quotidiana et instanti prece id ab Eo contendamus ob Iesu Christi merita. Utamur praeterea praesentissima Deiparae impetratione: cui conciliandae Nobis, quoniam has litteras die ipsa damus, quae recolendo Mariali Rosario est instituta; quidquid Decessor Noster de octobri mense Virgini augustae dicando edixit, publica per templa omnia eiusdem Rosarii recitatione, Nos pariter edicimus et confirmamus; monentes insuper ut deprecatores etiam adhibeantur castissimus Dei Matris Sponsus catholicae Ecclesiae patronus sanctique Petrus et Paulus apostolorum principes.

Quae omnia ut rite eveniant et cuncta vobis pro desiderio fortunentur, divinarum gratiarum subsidia uberrime exoramus. Testem vero suavissimae caritatis, qua vos et universos fideles, quos Dei providentia Nobis commendatos voluit, complectimur, vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, clero populoque vestro apostolicam benedictionem amantissime in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die iv octobris MCMIII, Pontificatus Nostri anno primo.

PIUS PP. X.

[48] Dan. 3 : 39.

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

Inaugural ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF POPE PIUS X, in which the Holy Father proclaims that the motto and keynote of his Pontificate will be *Instaurare omnia in Christo*, so that "Christ may be all and in all." He urges the Bishops throughout the Catholic universe to guard jealously the selection and training of our future priests, who in turn, each as an *alter Christus*, are exhorted to redouble their zeal for the conquest of the world to God through Jesus Christ. The various enactments of Pope Leo XIII regarding the October Devotions are expressly confirmed.

THE MARRIAGE OF AN ILL-INSTRUCTED CATHOLIC.

To the Rev. Editor of THE REVIEW:

The topic of the promises of mixed marriages, dealt with in the October REVIEW, recalls to my mind a case which came under my notice quite recently. A young lady, of German extraction, attending my church, whose knowledge of the Catholic religion was very meagre, kept company with a young man (German), who was baptized a Catholic (his father was a Protestant, and his mother a fallen-away Catholic), but never instructed in the Catholic religion, notwithstanding the fact that he was brought up and lived all his life-time within four blocks of the Catholic church and school. The young lady, in company with the young man, called upon me as pastor of her church, to make preparations for their coming marriage. I at once suggested that the intended husband should place himself under instructions until he could at least make his confession. The arrangement was that he would come every second night. Within two months he attended instructions about three times, offering various excuses for his being dilatory in the matter. I had no assurance that he could repeat the Lord's Prayer correctly, whilst he knew absolutely no other prayers. He seemed positively ignorant of the very rudiments of the Christian religion, and he proved to me unmistakably that he was wholly indifferent to the matter of accepting the Catholic faith. All he wanted was to get married to this lady, and she evidently wanted him. When he saw that I meant to insist on

his coming to instructions until he could make his confession, he and the lady, without my knowledge (some friend suggested it to them), called upon the Rt. Rev. Bishop, who, without consulting anyone, gave them a letter to the priest of a neighboring parish, instructing him to marry them in the Church. It was not a case of necessity; at least, so the young lady assured me. Hence these questions:

1. How is this marriage to be classified?
2. Can it take place in the Church?
3. Or, is it to be treated as a mixed marriage?
4. Did I do wrong in insisting that the young man come to instruction until in a position to comply with the conditions which the reception of a sacrament of the "living" implies?
5. Is the procedure of the Rt. Rev. Ordinary in this case to be approved of?

By answering these questions in the REVIEW, you will oblige a number of other priests, as well as myself.

Resp. 1. Both persons in the case mentioned were baptized Catholics. Although grossly neglected and grossly negligent, the young man was not a formal heretic, since he had never professed any but the Catholic faith, which fact would imply that he did not repudiate in a formal and public manner the allegiance to the Catholic Church expressed in his name by his sponsors. This means that he could not be classed as a baptized heretic, and hence there is no room for the application of a dispensation granted in cases of a mixed marriage.

2 and 3. For the same reason, apart from the scandal which his unworthy disposition, if known, might give, the only proper place for the marriage, if performed at all, would be the Catholic Church. The positive answer to the question, whether, in such cases, the marriage is to be performed, must depend on the attendant circumstances. It is true that a pastor is not to admit to the Sacraments those who are manifestly unworthy, or who propose to receive them in open sacrilege. But the right to declare a person manifestly unworthy so as to render the rite publicly sacrilegious, demands more on the part of the priest than that he have the conviction, however *seemingly* well grounded, that the applicant is sacrilegiously disposed. He must have the facts, such as the express statement or the sensible (not merely moral) evidence that the applicant is in the state of mortal sin, and that he refuses

to be sorry for such sin. Apart from such evidence, the priest cannot with certainty assume that the applicant is actually unworthy. Even if he knew him from the confessional to be so, he could not act on this information by publicly refusing to perform the marriage ceremony. For the rest, it is at least *possible* that a man in total ignorance of his baptismal faith may yet be free from such actual sin as would render him unworthy of the sacrament. This is more especially a condition in the case of the Sacrament of Matrimony, where a second party to the contract, presumably well disposed, is to be considered as having a right to the performance of the ceremony. It may be argued that a man who neglects his duty as a Catholic for years is certainly in the state of mortal sin; but that depends on the nature of his neglect and his realization of it. However, in the present case, the priest had the duty of assuring himself of the applicant's disposition.

4. And since the priest, as shepherd of his flock, being intent upon the salvation of souls, is bound to do all in his power to dispose the applicants for the Sacraments, it is difficult to see that the pastor, in the case as stated, could have done otherwise than insist on a proper and complete preparation for the marriage, all the more since the seemingly culpable ignorance and indifference of the young man, whilst it did not mean a formal repudiation of the faith of his baptism, supplied a strong presumption that he was in a state of grave sin resulting from negligence in so serious a matter. But this supposes that the party was under his legitimate control. As soon as the case had been taken out of the hands of the pastor by the bishop, the insistence on a preparation which, in all probability, would have borne its fruit in disposing the young man, ceased to be a duty for the priest.

5. The question, "Is the procedure of the Rt. Rev. Ordinary in this case to be approved of?" we could only answer if the Rt. Rev. Ordinary himself were to ask us. In that case, he would probably give us his motive, which is likely to reveal more explicit reasons for his action than the above presentation supplies.

THE DEVOTIONS INTRODUCED BY POPE LEO XIII.

A writer in the London *Tablet* (September 26th), referring to a statement made by us regarding the obligation of continuing to recite the prayers after Mass ordered by Pope Leo XIII, says:

"In the current issue of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW a reply is ventured to the doubts of 'Subscriber' and 'Sacerdos.' The writer remarks on the prayers in question that 'S. Congregation has declared that they are to continue in perpetuity—that is, until revoked by new legislation. Hence it would seem that the accustomed prayers are to be continued.' However, in conversation with my Ordinary last week I was assured that the October devotions were not of obligation. The prayers after Mass, I was told, were to continue."

The above statement does not give a correct view of what we said. Our remarks touching the declaration of the S. Congregation referred to the October devotions: thence we drew an analogy with regard to the prayers after Mass. That our view was entirely correct has—as far as the prayers after Mass are concerned—been since shown by a letter of Cardinal Gotti addressed to our Apostolic Delegate, Mgr. Falconio.

As to the October devotions, the writer in the *Tablet* cites his Ordinary's authority for their discontinuance. That authority might be good—in the diocese; but it is to all appearances contrary to the desires of the Holy See. The late Sovereign Pontiff wished the October devotions to continue. Not only does he express this in his encyclicals *Apostolatus* (Sept. 1, 1883) and *Superiori Anno* (Aug. 30, 1884) where he assigns the same reason for instituting this devotion which has moved him to emphasize the ordinance of his illustrious predecessor, Pius IX regarding the prayers to be said after Mass, but the S. Congregation of Rites in the Pontiff's name and authority issued three decrees *Urbis et Orbis* during the next following years (Aug. 20, 1885; Aug. 26, 1886; Sept. 11, 1887) in which the continuance of these devotions during the month of October in all parish churches, etc., is desired for all years to come until the Holy See shall have been restored to its full and rightful liberty. The words of the first-mentioned document are:

"Quapropter Sanctitas Sua *quaecunque duobus* praeteritis annis *constituit de mense quo solemnia celebrantnr Beatae Virginis Mariae a Rosario,* hoc pariter anno et *annis porro sequentibus praecipit et statuit quoadusque* rerum Ecclesiae rerumque publicarum tristissima haec perdurent adjuncta, ac de restituta Pontifici Maximo plena libertate, Deo

referre gratias Ecclesias datum non sit. *Decernit itaque et mandat, ut quolibet anno* a prima die Octobris ad secundam sequentis Novembris, in omnibus catholici orbis parochialibus templis, et in cunctis publicis oratoriis Deiparae dicatis aut in aliis etiam arbitrio Ordinarii eligendis, quinque saltem Mariani Rosarii decades cum Litaniis Lauretanis quotidie recitentur; quod si mane fiat Missa inter preces celebretur; si a meridie, sacrosanctum Eucharistiae Sacramentum adorationi proponatur, deinde fideles rite lustrentur."

Similar phraseology is used in the subsequent decrees of the S. Congregation. Furthermore the indulgences accorded to the aforesaid exercises have been incorporated in the permanent official collection of Indulgences, so as to give a particular force to the words of the late Pontiff which imply that the custom of the October devotions once gaining a firm hold on the faithful, will continue as a *votum* of thanksgiving, even after the immediate purpose of the institution, viz., the liberty of the Sovereign Pontiff, shall have been gained.

Last of all, the present Pontiff declares that these devotions are to be continued. Under these circumstances it does not appear lawful for a bishop to declare that the devotions are not to be performed in the parish churches of his diocese. As a rule the Holy See does not interfere with the discretion of an Ordinary in his own territory, unless he offend thereby against the canons of the Church Universal. A bishop is pope in his own diocese, so far as his jurisdiction goes; only he is not infallible, and hence may not be quoted as authority against papal behests.

THE SIGN OF THE CROSS AT THE END OF PUBLIC PRAYERS.

Qu. Should the sign of the Cross be made at the end of the prayers said after Mass by order of the Sovereign Pontiff?

Resp. There is no liturgical reason for making the sign of the Cross (either before or) after said prayers. The Mass concludes with a blessing by the celebrant, and the last Gospel and the prayers which follow are so to speak an extension of that conclusion. For this same reason the rubrics say nothing regarding the taking of holy water or making the sign of the Cross when the celebrant leaves the church to return to the sacristy after the celebration of Mass, whilst on the other hand he is directed by the rubrics to

take holy water and make the sign of the Cross on entering the church for the beginning of the Mass. It may therefore be inferred from the general rubrics that the sign of the Cross is not to be made after the Mass, since the blessing given just after the *Ite Missa est*, suffices. The same is true of a Requiem Mass, for since the Church excludes the blessing in this case entirely, there is no reason for introducing it in the added prayers at the end.

Nevertheless it would not be a legitimate conclusion to argue that those who make the sign of the Cross after the prayers at Mass violate the letter of the rubrics. These prayers are not a part of the liturgy proper, although they are obligatory. They are usually said in the vernacular, and in any case supposed to be recited alternately with the people, in order to direct a united prayer for obtaining one common end. Now the people are accustomed to begin and end their devotions and important actions with the sign of the Cross. They will naturally make it at the conclusion of these prayers, and, unless specially instructed in the reason of the omission, they could hardly understand it. Under such circumstances a priest might follow the common inclination, and having once introduced the custom it would seem wiser to retain it than to omit it, since there is no explicit direction on the subject in the rubrics. This is the view which the S. Congregation has taken in various decisions regarding the making the sign of the Cross where it is neither prescribed nor prohibited by the rubrics of the choir office. "*Servetur consuetudo*—let the custom be retained where it is in vogue."[1]

In cases where a difference of practice exists in the same church, a good-natured understanding to agree upon a uniform practice, whatever it be, is the natural way to avoid disedification. The pastor naturally leads in such things, and a sense of order prompts every sensible man to conform in the case of slight diversities like this.

WHICH MASS AT THE ANNUAL REQUIEM FOR THE DECEASED DIOCESAN CLERGY?

Qu. The pious custom has existed in this diocese for more than thirty years of celebrating a Solemn High Mass of Requiem during the

[1] *Cf.* S.R.C., Dec. 20, 1864; Ord. M.S.Franc.—13 Apr. 1867, Bobien.

annual retreat, for the repose of the souls of the deceased bishops and priests of the diocese. On that occasion at the retreat this year there was a difference of opinion between the celebrant and the master of ceremonies—some others held opposite views also—as to what Mass should be said; one asserting that it should be the Mass *quotidiana*, without any change of prayers, because it was not an anniversary, and the other maintaining that it should be the anniversary *lato sensu*, according to the decree of the S. R. C., December 2, 1891; with the prayer "Deus qui inter apostolicos"; because, though it was not a strict anniversary, nor did the priests constitute a confraternity, it would fall under the privilege granted to those Masses "quae pro fidelium pietate infra octavam Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum locum habent"—the deceased bishops and priests of an entire diocese being entitled to as great a privilege as the deceased members of a single congregation.[1]

The opinion of the REVIEW will be welcomed by many; among whom is

Yours faithfully,

A. B. C.

Resp. The solemn Mass annually celebrated for the deceased bishops and priests of the diocese is to be regarded, according to the approved interpretation of liturgical writers, as an *anniversaria late sumpta*, which by a general decree of the S. C. of Rites, January 30, 1896, n. 3920, enjoys the privileges of ordinary liturgical anniversaries. Accordingly the Mass *in anniversario defunctorum* (third in the Missal) is to be said with *one* oration. This oration is not, however, the one contained in the *missa in anniversario*, which would be unsuitable, but one of the *Orationes diversae* either *pro pluribus defunctis* or *pro defunctis fratribus, propinquis et benefactoribus*, or the one *pro Omnibus Fidelibus Defunctis*.[2]

Appeltern,[3] referring to Masses (anniversaries) of this kind, writes "*in dictis anniversariis* dicenda est *missa quotidiana* cum unica oratione . . . et 'Dies Irae,'" but since the *missa quotidiana* is really the same as the *missa anniversaria*, the celebrant being free, according to the general rubrics, to substitute the Epistle and Gospel of the latter for those of the former, there is practically no difference.

[1] THE ECCL. REVIEW, November, 1902, p. 495; Baltimore Ordo, *Monita*, p. 7.
[2] *Cf.* Van der Stappen, Rubr. Missal, n. 367.
[3] Vol. 1, Qu. 78, n. 3.

A PROPOSAL TO FORM BANDS OF TOTAL ABSTINENCE PREACHERS.

(Communicated.)

Permit me to thank you for the article in the current number of the REVIEW on the movement to promote Total Abstinence among the clergy. It is very gratifying to find such an able explanation of a widely misunderstood work, and on reading it I appreciated what a great help it will be to us. While we have no wish to antagonize those who do not favor the movement, we have been put on the defensive. Whether wilfully or not, they misunderstand and will not be convinced. Practically the society is nothing more than, as you have said, an object-lesson to the laity, so that the work of preaching the doctrine of Total Abstinence may be made more effective by the practice on the part of those who preach. I proposed to Father Shanley that we would form bands of total abstinence preachers, on the plan of Missioners to Non-Catholics, to preach total abstinence in each diocese, and incidentally these preachers would of course have to be total abstainers. Such a band of known total abstainers would be at the service of the clergy for the formation and encouragement of societies of total abstainers, anniversary celebrations, etc. This would obviate the frequent anomaly of a total abstinence sermon or address being delivered by one not in sympathy with the cause. The main source of membership will have to be the seminary, and so gradually a public sentiment will be cultivated among the clergy in favor of total abstinence for themselves as well as for the laity. The conditions to-day are favorable, and I think the new society will do effective work. Gradually the number of the opponents of total abstinence among the clergy is growing less. Thank you again for your able help.

J. L.

THE PRIESTS' TOTAL ABSTINENCE LEAGUE OF AMERICA.

The Total Abstinence League of Priests in the United States, to whose work we directed attention in the last number of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, is making swift headway. A number of the leading Bishops in the country have already signified their cordial appreciation and willingness to aid the movement. His

Grace the Archbishop of Cincinnati, in thanking the League for having tendered him the Honorary Presidency, writes as follows:

". . . I cannot, indeed, promise much active service and I judge from the title (Honorary President) that you do not expect any great activity. But even of that I will gladly contribute all that is in my power. Nothing is more worthy of the sacred Priesthood, nor more effectual in producing spiritual fruits, than that we give high example to our people, and take the lead ourselves in the practice of the self-denial that we recommend to those under our pastoral care.

With all esteem your servant in Christ,

† WILLIAM HENRY ELDER,

Archbishop of Cincinnati.

Cincinnati, O., August 21, 1903."

No less cordial is the endorsement of the illustrious Archbishop of Philadelphia, who writes to the Secretary, the Rev. Dr. J. T. Mullen:

"It affords me great gratification to learn of the formation of a Priests' Total Abstinence League. Drunkenness is one of the greatest curses of the day. The most effective weapon against it, and indeed the only weapon for the reformation of those who have become victims of strong drink, is total abstinence. This weapon is irresistible in the hands of the priests and hierarchy of the country, especially if wielded by those who are themselves total abstainers. I recommend the association to all who have regard for my opinion, and I authorize you to place my name on the roll of membership.

Faithfully yours in Christ,

† P. J. RYAN,

Archbishop of Philadelphia."

The League has issued its Constitution and By-Laws, which are very brief. They provide for a permanent propaganda of the work through Diocesan Promoters. Every member in charge of souls is expected to preach on the subject of Temperance at least twice a year, and to organize Temperance Societies, especially for the young. The annual assessment to defray necessary expenses of the League is one dollar, payable to the League Treasurer.

THE CROSSES IN PORTABLE ALTARS.

Qu. When portable altars are consecrated, are not five crosses to be cut into the stone,—one in the middle, and one in each corner? In all the liturgical books treating of the construction of altars the five crosses are mentioned as cut into the stone—yet the Roman Pontifical does not say so, or is not clear in regard to the matter.

Resp. The incision of the five crosses in the altar stone is customary, and serves the purpose of indicating the parts which have been anointed in the ceremony of consecration. But it is neither essential nor prescribed. "*Ordinarie incisae habentur* cruces quinque in locis specialiter inunctis in superficie arae." (Van der Stappen, *De celebratione missae*, art. II, 4.)

THE "DEO GRATIAS" IN THE "MISSA SOLEMNIS."

Qu. Is it proper for the choir to chant the "Deo gratias" at the conclusion of the Epistle?

Resp. The *Gradduale* and the *Ordinarium Missae* say nothing of the chanting of the *Deo gratias* after the Epistle, or of the *Laus tibi, Christe* after the Gospel in solemn Masses. As the notation for all other parts which are to be sung by the choir is given in the Gradual we must infer that these responses are merely to be *said* by the ministers of the Mass. The custom of having them sung by the choir has indeed been largely introduced, but it seems to have no warrant in the liturgical law.

CHANTING THE EPISTLE IN A "MISSA CANTATA."

Qu. The rubrics prescribe (Tit. VI, 8) that in a "missa cantata" the Epistle is to be chanted by a cleric who assists vested in surplice. If I sing Mass in a convent, where there are only two little boys serving the Mass in cassock and surplice, neither of whom could chant the Epistle, would it be allowable for a religious—a nun in choir—to chant the Epistle, whilst the celebrant reads it?

Resp. If the celebrant wishes, he may simply *read* the Epistle in a "missa cantata." It is not permissible to have it chanted by a member of the choir, whether a nun or lay person. (Cf. *Decret. authent.*, n. 3350, April 23, 1875.)

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

1. **Commentary.**—We often hear it said that our present-day criticism teaches us more about the Bible than of the Bible; that it rather diminishes our esteem for the Sacred Scriptures than increases our understanding of their contents. But all apprehensions of this kind are allayed, at least to a certain extent, by a survey of the most recent exegetical literature. The Book of Numbers, *e. g.*, has been explained by G. B. Gray[1] and H. Holzinger,[2] while Father de Hummelauer has published a commentary on the Book of Josue.[3] Professor Holzinger's work forms part of the series known as *Marti's Hand-Kommentar*, and Father de Hummelauer belongs to the corps of German Jesuit Fathers who publish the *Cursus Scripturæ Sacræ*. This latter writer disagrees in his new commentary with all the higher and with nearly all of the textual critics. He does not admit the Hexateuch theory in order to explain the stylistic agreements and discrepancies between the Book of Josue and the Pentateuch; nor does he, as a general rule, favor the Hebrew rather than the Greek reading in those passages in which the Septuagint text differs from the Masoretic.—Next in order comes Father Lagrange's commentary on the Book of Judges.[4] After removing the preface and the appendices, the learned Dominican Professor derives the remaining part of the Book from two sources which were combined by a first redactor, and then passed through the hands of a second one. He denotes the sources provisionally by the symbols J and E without committing himself to the view that they are identical with the sources J and E of the Hexateuch.—Budde's Samuel forms the next link in the chain

[1] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers.* Edinburgh, 1903. 8vo, pp. 542.

[2] *Numeri erklärt.* Tübingen, 1903. 8vo, pp. xviii—176.

[3] *Commentarius in librum Iosue.* Parisiis 1903, P. Lethielleux, pp. vi—531.

[4] *Le Livre des Juges.* Paris 1903, V. Lecoffre.

of recent commentaries.[5] The writer believes that the oldest editorial work which we can trace in the Book of Samuel has simply united two original writings, and these writings were the summary of all that pre-exilic tradition which has been preserved for us in the Books of Samuel. The character of the more recent of these sources appears to the author to be in keeping with the document denoted in the critical analysis of the Hexateuch by E. At the same time, it appears to have been drawn up in Judah, after the fall of the Northern Kingdom. Budde is inclined to connect the second of the above sources with the document indicated by the symbol J. We cannot here indicate the weak points in the author's theory, nor can we give a detailed list of his valuable suggestions as to the textual corrections of the Masoretic text.—The second edition of Duhm's Isaias is rightly numbered among the recent commentaries, though the first edition of the work appeared ten years ago.[6] The book belongs to the series of Nowack's *Handkommentar z. A. T.;* as such it does not claim to be an anthology of fine thoughts, and therefore abstains from citing the various views of different commentators. Its exposition is clear, its style interesting, its treatment of the prophecies suggestive. But with these excellences are joined serious defects. Duhm's textual emendations are in many cases highly conjectural, his views as to apocryphal interpolations are unfounded, and his theory of a Trito-Isaias is considered, at best, as doubtful even among the critics.—In the next place we may mention the Rev. John Adams' *Minor Prophets.*[7] This little volume belongs to the *Bible Class Primers*, edited by Principal Salmond, D.D. The first chapter deals with "Israel's Ideal," "Assyria," and "Hebrew Prophecy." In the next chapter are considered the pre-exilic prophets; in the third, the post-exilic prophets; the last chapter is devoted to the "Prophets of Uncertain Date." The author intends to familiarize the rank and file of the Church with modern methods of Bible study, but he does not tell the reader anything

[5] *Die Bücher Samuel.* Erklärt von Dr. Karl Budde. Tübingen and Leipzig. J. C. B. Mohr.

[6] *Das Buch Jesaia.* Von B. Duhm. Zweite verbesserte Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1902.

[7] *The Minor Prophets.* By Rev. John Adams. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1902.

about their respective value or worthlessness.—Bertholet's "Esra und Nehemia" will be the last Old Testament commentary of the present series.[8] The author is of opinion that the twelve years of Nehemia's administration preceded the time of Esdras' reform; the latter he assigns to about 430 B. C. He rejects the identification of Sassabasar with Zorobabel, but he identifies the former with one of the sons of Jechonias, mentioned in I Par. 3: 18.

Passing on to the exegetical literature of the New Testament, we must note first a small volume by the Abbé H. Lesêtre, entitled *The Key of the Gospels.*[9] The author tells us first all about the introductory questions; the authorship of the Gospels, their end and aim, their text, language, and historical character, their inspiration, and about the synoptic and Joannine problems. In the second part he surveys the times of our Lord from an historical, geographical, religious, social, and linguistic point of view. Finally, he gives us a sketch of the gospel-harmony, of Christ's relations to various persons, of His main doctrines, His miracles, His parables, of His resurrection, His personal character, and His divinity. The narrow compass of the book demands the utmost brevity in all these special treatises.—The seventh edition of Broadus' *Harmony of the Gospels* has just been published. Its first edition appeared in 1893. In its new form the work is revised and enlarged by Prof. A. T. Robertson, who has succeeded Dr. Broadus in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville., Ky.[10]—Besides these general explanations of all the Gospels, two commentaries on particular Gospels deserve our attention. Thdr.Zahn has published a commentary on the first Gospel.[11] The author is so well known to our circle of readers that he needs no further introduction. — The second special commentary is an explanation of the Fourth Gospel by Prof. J. M. S. Baljon.[12] Per-

[8] *Die Bücher Esra und Nehemia.* Erklärt von Lic. Alfred Bertholet. Tübingen und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr; London: Williams and Norgate.

[9] *La Clef des Évangiles.* Introduction historique et critique pour servir à la lecture des saints évangiles. Ouvrage orné des gravures et de cartes; 2 ed. Paris: P. Lethielleux. 8vo, pp. viii—208.

[10] Messrs. A. C. Armstrong and Son, New York.

[11] *Das Evangelium des Matthäus, ausgelegt.* Leipzig, 1903. 8vo, pp. viii—714.

[12] *Commentaar op het Evangelie van Johannes.* Utrecht, 1902. J. van Boekhoven, pp. 343.

haps the reader remembers the *Novum Testamentum Græce* published by the same author in 1898, or his *Commentary on Matthew* published in 1900, or again his history of the New Testament books issued in 1901. The general characteristics of the new commentary are the same as those of the author's Matthew. He discusses the terms λόγος, σάρξ, ζωή, φῶς, and μονογενής more at length, but not satisfactorily. He often refers to the writings of Van Eerde, Kreyenbühl, B. Weiss, Wendt, and H. J. Holtzmann, but he does not sympathize with the allegorizing processes of H. J. Holtzmann and J. R. Van Eerde, nor with the hypotheses of Wendt, Spitta, and Bacon. The chronological questions connected with the Fourth Gospel are but superficially investigated, and the author is avowedly incapable of harmonizing the apparent inconsistencies between St. John's Gospel and the Synoptics.—G. Wohlenberg has issued a commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians,[13] and K. Endemann has added a new attempt to solve the riddles of the Apocalypse.[14] We do not believe that the reader will find anything of importance in either of these books which he has not read in other commentaries. We speak, of course, of views consistent with the Catholic faith.—Perhaps another book, from the pen of Dr. Mgr. Rohling, of Prague, may be classed among the commentaries on the Apocalypse.[15] The reader is acquainted with the various efforts to solve the questions connected with the Zionist movement and the revival of Palestine and Jerusalem. The Abbé Lémann, a Jewish convert, in his work entitled *L'Avénir de Jerusalem* treats the subject as "une chimère." Mgr. Rohling answers the Abbé's arguments, and points out the providential gathering of the house of Jacob in the land of its birth where it will have to accomplish its great destiny according to the words of the prophet. The orthodox Jews will be converted to Christ by the preaching of Elias; the unorthodox will follow the Antichrist, born in their

[13] *Der erste und zweite Thessalonicherbrief ausgelegt.* Leipzig, 1903, 8vo, pp. 214.

[14] *Die Offenbarung St. Johannis*, für Theologen und gebildete Nichttheologen ausgelegt. Berlin, 1903, 8vo, pp. iii—271.

[15] *En Route pour Sion:* ou la Grande Espérance d'Israel et de toute l'humanité. Traduit de l'Allemand par Ernest Rohmer, Miss. Apostol. de Terre-Sainte. Paris, P. Lethielleux, pp. xix—336.

midst. These latter will persecute the true believers, they will crucify Elias, and finally pay the penalty for their infidelity. The converted Jews will form the centre of the world; Jerusalem will be their capital; our glorified Redeemer will be their ruler, and at the same time replace the Roman Pontiff as visible head of the Church. Mgr. Rohling's views, therefore, agree substantially with those of Father Lacunza (Ben-Ezra), and must be judged in the light of the fate which befell the latter's famous publication entitled *La venida del Mesias en gloria y majestad.*

2. Special Texts.— Dr. Karl Miketta, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Weidenau, has published a monograph on the Pharaoh of the Exodus.[16] The author devotes a pamphlet of more than 120 pages to an exegetical study of Ex. 1–15. He first investigates the time of the Exodus in the light of Egyptian and Babylonian synchronisms; secondly, he studies the historical setting of the event in the light of Biblical sources; thirdly, he makes us acquainted with the Egyptian inscriptions bearing on the subject; finally, he exploits the pertinent data given by the Tell-el-Amarna letters. Dr. Miketta's pamphlet certainly deserves a serious study. Professor R. F. Weidner, president of the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Chicago, has published a little volume of outline studies on the Book of Exodus.[17] He takes up one chapter after another in regular order, and studies its contents. The author endeavors to adhere faithfully to the traditional view of Old Testament history.—Professor Haupt, of the Johns Hopkins University, contributes to the July number of *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, a study on Isaias' parable of the vineyard (Is. 5 : 1–7). He first arranges the text of the passage in four stanzas; then, he gives us his critical notes followed by an English translation of the passage; thirdly, he adds a series of explanatory notes. Though Professor Haupt's article contains many valuable suggestions, we can not follow the writer in all his textual changes of the passage. —Professor Driver contributes to *The Expositor* a series of articles entitled "Translations from the Prophets." In the January num-

[16] *Biblische Studien*, viii. Bd., 2 Hft.: Der Pharao des Auszuges; Freiburg, 1903, B. Herder.

[17] Fleming H. Revell Co., Chicago.

ber he interprets Jer. 4: 3; 6: 30; in the February number, Jer. 7: 1; 9: 22; in the March number, Jer. 9: 23; 11: 8; in the April number, Jer. 11: 9; 12: 6; in the May number, Jer. 12: 7; 16: 9; in the July number, Jer. 22 and 23. The reader is too well acquainted with Professor Driver's views on Biblical questions to need any further description of the foregoing translations.—During the course of the year Professor Herman Gunkel published in the pages of the *Biblical World* an English translation and explanation of a number of Psalms. Thus the January number contains Ps. 46; the February number, Ps. 1; the March number, Ps. 8; the April number, Ps. 19: 1–6; the May number, Ps. 24; the June number, Ps. 42 and 43; the September number, Ps. 103. We must confess that some passages of the English translation are most beautiful; but then, how can beauty be lacking where we have even the shadow of a Psalm? We do not believe, however, that the reader will be satisfied in all cases with Professor Gunkel's rendering.—Professor Andrew Harper's *Song of Solomon*,[18] might have been classed among the series of commentaries. But its two Appendices seem to place it rather among the rank of special studies. In the first Appendix, the author arranges the song in thirteen dramatic lyrics; in the second, he refutes Budde's interpretation of the Book. Hence the theory that the Song of Songs is a mere chance collection of wedding songs is repudiated; its dramatic character is vindicated. The book belongs to the series entitled *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*.—We must not leave the special studies of Old Testament texts without adding Professor Rothstein's monograph on I Par. 3: 17–24.[19] The author admits, and even emphasizes the fact that a large part of his book consists of hypotheses; but he claims plausibility for them in every case. One is, at times, startled by the novelty of the writer's views; but the novelty of a solution to an old difficulty does not necessarily imply that it is wrong.

[18] *The Song of Solomon*, with Introduction and Notes. New York, 1902. The Macmillan Co.: pp. xi—96.

[19] Die Genealogie des Königs Jojachin und seiner Nachkommen in geschichtlicher Beleuchtung. . . . nebst einem Anhange: Ein übersehenes Zeugniss für die messianische Auffassung des "Knechtes Jahwes." Berlin, 1902. Reuther und Reichard, pp. 162.

The view, *e. g.*, that Sassabasar is not the same person as Zorobabel may not be novel; but Rothstein's contention that the former is the latter's father is certainly startling. In the appendix of his work, Dr. Rothstein gives a most ingenious, an almost too ingenious, argument for the Messianic interpretation of the "Servant of Jahweh."

Perhaps the first place among special studies on New Testament texts is due to Dr. Valentin Schmitt's pamphlet on the promise of the Eucharist, contained in John 6.[20] But Dr. Schmitt does not entitle his monograph so broadly; he limits his investigation to the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, and of Chrysostom; he exploits the catechetical work of the former, and he lays under contribution the homilies of the latter. While the author vindicates the true teaching of the Antiochene Fathers, he also keeps in view the various opinions of our present-day Protestants, of men like Ebrard, Steitz, Harnack, Nitzsch, Gieseler, Siegel, Münscher, Neander, and Bonwetsch. The work certainly deserves a careful study. — In *The Expositor* for May the Rev. F. W. Mozley writes on the true meaning of τοῦτο ποιεῖτε. The writer guardedly attacks Prof. T. K. Abbott's thesis that τοῦτο ποιεῖτε must be interpreted "perform this action," without any sacrificial meaning. He concludes that the evidences for the sacrificial sense of the formula may not justify an actual demand for its acceptance; but the adherents of the sacrificial meaning of the formula are justified to wait for a clearer refutation of that meaning than has been given by Professor Abbott.—In an article in the May number of *The Expositor*, Prof. A. E. Garvie considers "The Companionship of the Twelve." The writer insists on the importance of Peter's confession of Jesus' Messiasship, and he upholds his view with good arguments. At the same time, he contends that Peter received on this occasion no privilege peculiar to himself, and transmissible by him alone. The contention is an old one, and has been often refuted. But Protestants must either repeat it, or surrender to the successor of St. Peter.—Mr. Edward Williams has endeavored to determine once for all the true Christian doctrine on divorce. Hence, he has published a small

[20] Die Verheissung der Eucharistie bei den Antiochenern Cyrillus von Jerusalem und Johannes Chrysostomus; Würzburg, 1903; Göbel und Scherer; pp. vi—102.

volume, entitled *The Scriptural Doctrine of Divorce.*[21] The writer seems to reach a conclusion similar to that of Professor Bacon, in his book on the *Sermon on the Mount.* Christ's utterances concerning marriage are not to be taken as *legal dicta*, but must be regarded as precepts. We need not here point out that such an interpretation is not only wholly unfounded, but does positive violence to the words of our Lord.—*The Biblical World* for July contains an article on "the eschatology of Paul," contributed by Prof. Samuel MacComb, D.D. The writer is of opinion that the Apostle casts his doctrine on the above subject into a Jewish mold. He distinguishes four acts in the eschatological drama of the close of the world's history: *a.* The Second Coming of Christ: *b.* The Resurrection; *c.* The Final Judgment; *d.* The Resignation of the Mediatorial Kingdom into the Hands of the Father. Finally, he tries to strip Paul's doctrine of the Jewish dramatic schema, and to express the results in Ritschl's dogmatic formula.—Margaret D. Gibson contributed a note to *The Expository Times* for April in which she endeavored to explain the parable of the Unjust Steward in a satisfactory way. According to this writer, the master of the steward had farmed out his property, so that the steward could demand much more from the cultivators than he himself had to pay his master. Thus the steward merely renounced his own exorbitant profits by allowing his cultivators to write less in their bills than he had first demanded of them. Our Lord, therefore, could praise his way of acting without giving the slightest offence to his Oriental audience.

[21] Alliance Publishing Co., New York; pp. 144.

Criticisms and Notes.

LITURGICAL NOTES ON THE MASS. By Charles Cowley Clarke, Priest, St. Mary Magdalene's, Brighton. Brighton: Henry J. Smith, 80 King's Road. 1903. Pp. 75.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS. An Explanation of Its Doctrine, Rubrics, and Prayers. With Introduction. By the Rev. M. Gavin, S.J. London: Burns and Oates; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. 176.

Few studies are more fascinating to a mind capable of appreciating the highest expression of truth and beauty than those that occupy themselves with the liturgy of the Church. Naturally, the chief interest of such studies clusters about the Blessed Sacrament, especially in its sacrificial aspect. Father Clarke, in a well-printed little volume, illustrates the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist as a sacrifice, by dwelling upon the salient points of an historical and archæological character. In this respect the book pursues a line quite apart from that of similar manuals, such as Bishop Howley's *Explanation of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*, or Father Gavin's excellent treatise—noticed here—on the same subject. After a brief definition of the Mass, calculated to give the reader a proper sense of the power and dignity of the august worship to which he is called in assisting at the Holy Sacrifice, the author goes briefly over the story of the development of the liturgical form which guards and unfolds the divine mystery. The Mass of the early Christian days, with the ancient, simple order of preparatory readings and prayers, of oblation and consecration, of participation and communion, is first explained and then illustrated in some of those beautiful details with which the average lay reader is probably not familiar, but which enhance the deep appreciation we must have of our own dignity in being permitted to assist at so solemn a function. The Anaphora, introducing the Canon, with preface, trisagion, diptychs before the consecration; then the offering proper, the fraction and commixture, the Blessing, and the old custom of the Antidoron or distribution of bread to the catechumens, present interesting points of thoughtful devotion to the reader who, with the ancient chanter in *The Lay Folk's Massbook*, realizes that—

The worthiest thing, most of goodness
In all the world, it is the Mass.
If a thousand clerks did naught else,
According as St. Jerome tells,
But told the virtues of Mass-singing,
And the profit of Mass-hearing,
Yet should they never the fifth part,
For all their wit and all their art,
Tell the virtue, needs and pardon
To them that with devotion,
In cleanness and with good intent,
Do worship to this Sacrament.

Father Gavin's book is a complete explanation of the Holy Sacrifice, something in the order of *Gihr's* great work on the Mass (Herder), only that it is much more brief and intended for an entirely practical purpose. The book is in fact the result of a series of instructions—some twenty-eight—given to mixed congregations in a large city. It is a booklet which one may very profitably place in the hands of respectful or devout non-Catholics who have wrong notions about our liturgy. To Catholics, of course, it is a source of information which confirms devotion by an intelligent appreciation of those many rites which are all symbols and expressions of piety, adoration, petition, and thanksgiving in the highest sense as of the highest worth. The Introduction is especially valuable, and explains things commonly passed over as having lost their original meaning. Thus we learn why the Bishop vests at the altar and not in the sacristy; why he says *Pax vobis* in place of *Dominus vobiscum*. Indeed, there is a great amount of historical erudition gathered in Father Gavin's Exposition, which causes us appropriately to group it with the *Liturgical Notes* of Father Clarke. The two little volumes are admirably conceived, and furnish exceptional material for special instruction or reading by the intelligent and educated. The typography is better than that usually found in such books.

EDGAR; or, From Atheism to the Full Truth. By the Rev. Louis von Hammerstein, S.J. Translated from the German at the Georgetown Visitation Convent. Preface by the Rev. John A. Conway, S.J. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1903. Pp. 355.

The author, whose name is familiar to readers of present-day Catholic literature in the German, is a convert and a Jesuit. His purpose is to lead others who wander in the shadow of religious error to a

realization of the truth of the Catholic Church, in which he himself has found the answer to all his former doubts, and with it permanent peace of mind. In order to bring home to the reader the harmony of Catholic doctrine, its consistency, and its power to soothe the troubled heart, he introduces a young infidel lawyer, Edgar, who, being taken ill during a journey in the south of England, and conveyed to a Catholic hospital, there finds the solution of all his doubts concerning the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, Christianity with its effects upon the individual and society. A Sister of Charity, calm, cheerful, ever ready to serve without apparently any material recompense, making no distinction of persons, unbroken by hours of labor, indifferent though not unresponsive to gratitude, with no attachments that could bind her down and lessen her devotion to the most trying duties, first sets him thinking upon the source of such contentment and efficiency. He asks her. She answers that the thought of heaven suffices for it all. When he questions further, she brings to him a priest, with whom he is at liberty to discuss all that weighs upon his mind. The conversation between the two becomes an exposition of Catholic doctrine, in which all the objections of materialists and rationalists are taken up as presented by the young lawyer, and answered with logical satisfaction by the priest. "It would be a mistake," says Father Conway in his thoughtful Preface to the volume, "to imagine that 'Edgar' is only a refutation of errors; its aim is to be as useful to the believer as to the unbeliever. It gives the reason, as far as it can be given, for the faith that we profess. . . . No objection that can be made seems to escape Edgar, and every difficulty is answered with patient kindness and honest frankness. There is no special pleading; reason is met fairly by reason, fact by fact, and theory by theory." The first part of the book has, as already intimated, the form of a dialogue between Edgar and the priest who visits the patient in the evening hours, and leads him to see the order in the universe that gives evidence of a personal, creative, and conserving intelligence. After a time the priest is called away from his charge to another city, and the remainder of the argument is continued in letters between the two. This has the natural advantage of allowing the introduction of facts and figures which confirm the Catholic argument, but could hardly be supposed to be at the command of an apologist in casual converse.

The translation is, as the editor states, a faithful reproduction of the original, but preserves the ease and grace of good English. We

share Father Conway's hope that the book "may do as much good amongst the English-speaking readers as did the first editions among the Germans."

THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR. For Catholic Schools and Institutions. Translated from the German of the Rev. Andreas Petz, by a Member of the Dominican Order. The M. H. Wiltzius Co.: Milwaukee. 1903. Pp. 288.

It was an excellent idea to translate into English the little volume by Petz which in brief and comprehensive form gives the explanation of the rites and seasons of the Ecclesiastical Year. Teachers have of course had at their command books such as Butler's *Feasts and Fasts*, Gueranger's and Gaume's Explanations of the Liturgy, Spirago's large Catechism, Lambing's Manuals, etc., but these are either too diffuse to serve the purpose of school-manuals, or they do not cover the entire ground. Here, however, we have in a small compass all that one need know in order to appreciate the ceremonial and usages of the Catholic Church. The language is clear, and the topics are arranged in logical order—first, the general divisions of the ecclesiastical year, and the particular festal cycles; next, the Holy Sacrifice, the Sacraments, and Sacramentals. The translation is good and free, and supplements many things not in the original but decidedly advantageous. There is a good index, and altogether the book serves a very useful purpose in a becoming form.

WHAT THE CHURCH TEACHES. An answer to earnest inquirers. By Edwin Drury, Priest of the Diocese of Louisville. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. 339.

There appears to be a providence in the present multiplication of expositions of Catholic Doctrine which appeal alike to the intelligence of earnest Catholics and unprejudiced non-Catholics. Father Drury, who is introduced to the reader by Bishop Spalding of Peoria, sets forth clearly the teaching of the Catholic Church, but in such manner, as he says, "that the Christian doctrines which are still held and believed by many non-Catholics may appear in their proper setting." In other words, the author, who himself is probably a convert, puts himself in the position of one who has no particular predisposition unless it be for receiving an unbiased statement of facts and principles. In this way he takes up one after another the beliefs and practices enjoined and supported by Catholic doctrinal authority, shows their reasonableness and beneficent effects, and asks in conclu-

sion that the reader avail himself of the knowledge acquired to embrace the one great medium of eternal salvation found alone in the Catholic Church. The volume is neatly printed and deserves to be widely spread, especially among earnest non-Catholics who may have a misconception of what the Church teaches.

THE SYMBOL OF THE APOSTLES. A Vindication of the Apostolic Authorship of the Creed on the lines of Catholic Tradition. By the Very Rev. Alexander MacDonald, D.D., Vicar General of the Diocese of Antigonish, N. S. New York: Christian Press Association Publishing Company. 1903. Pp. 377.

Dr. MacDonald's work bears the marks of an all-sided ecclesiastical erudition, and hence comes opportunely at a time when scholars of so potent a name as that of Professor Harnack enter a field of controversy regarding the authenticity and value of the Patristic evidence upon which Catholic tradition rests its formularies and ritual. The German theologian had written professedly upon the origin and purpose of the Apostles' Creed,[1] discrediting the accepted tradition; and a host of theological non-Catholic writers at once espoused his views as those of an oracle, whereby they assumed to weaken the claim to Apostolic integrity of the Roman Church. Dr. MacDonald, with singular critical acumen, goes over the whole ground, examines the Patristic statements, their mutual connection and bearing, and the import of their historical evidence as a basis for doctrinal expression. The importance of his argument is not confined to a showing forth of the inconsistencies of his non-Catholic opponents.

In view of the fact that Catholic theologians of note, such as the Benedictine Dom Morin in France, P. Baumer in Germany, and the Barnabite G. Semeria in Italy, have admitted that the Apostles' Creed, our most ancient symbol of faith, cannot be clearly shown to antedate the middle of the second century, our author lays special stress upon the more or less explicit statements of such authorities as St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, Rufinus, and Leo the Great, who speak of the Catholic symbol as having been instituted by the holy Apostles; and he shows the formula referred to by them to have been, with little variation, the Baptismal Creed of all the Churches up to their time and later. The doubts raised by the absence of any written record among the Constitutions of the Apostolic age, giving the full text of the symbol, is explained, and we think quite satisfactorily, by the so-called discipline of

[1] London: Adam and Charles Black.

the Secret (*arcannm*), which was intended to safeguard the holiness of the Christian profession against the criticisms, taunts, and abuses of those who were hostile to a religion which they did not understand, but the practice of which was a silent reproach to the worldly and sensual, an effectual refutation of the pagan ethics advocated in high places. The early Christians were to learn the Creed in the Church, but not from books "which at times fall into the hands of unbelievers" who would misinterpret its meaning; and for this reason they were especially warned never to write it. Here too Dr. MacDonald meets with striking readiness the objections brought by Schaff against the universality or efficiency of the observance of the *arcanum* in the Church. Indeed this part of the exposition is exceedingly well done, and happily so, because in the last analysis it affords the strongest basis for the entire argument.

One of the most interesting chapters in the volume is the concluding one. It has a practical value, inasmuch as it throws definite light upon the sense in which we use the name of *Catholic* as distinguished from *Roman Catholic*. It is from a different pen, but forms an appropriate conclusion to Dr. MacDonald's splendid work.

For the rest, our readers are already familiar with the subject-matter of this volume, the substance of which first appeared in these pages as a series of articles eliciting much attention from those learned in Patristic theology. We are glad that their present form is to give them a permanent place in the controversial and expository theological literature of our country, which has but few such works to boast of.

RAMBLES THROUGH EUROPE, THE HOLY LAND AND EGYPT. By the Rev. A. Zurbonsen. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1903. Pp. 234.

An interesting description of countries, men, and things as they impress the observant modern traveller through the Old World. There are important and deeply striking lessons to be learned from the comparison of those diverse conditions which present themselves in rapid succession, marking the contrasts of natural development, of personal temperament, and of material progress, in the lands favored by different climes and governments and national intercourse; and our author, who is a philosopher as well as a traveller, takes occasion from his impressions to muse upon the historic, the ethical, and the religious elements suggested by the scenes and peoples visited. The volume is pleasant and instructive reading, and may serve as a guide

to the numerous pilgrims who are enticed each year over this same route, and the strange and attractive landmarks of which bid fair to vanish in no very long time through the modernizing habits introduced, especially by the American traveller. The journeys hitherto made by camels and donkeys and in the primitive caravan style through the Bedouin camps, will shortly be made by electric tramways and locomobiles; and then books like this will seem to be mere romances, yet withal the more attractive.

MORAL BRIEFS. A Concise, Reasoned, and Popular Exposition of Catholic Morals. By the Rev. John H. Stapleton. Hartford, Conn.: The Catholic Transcript. 1903.

Here we have ninety-nine chapters which briefly deal in turn with the great bulk of practical questions in dogma and morals to be answered in the conscience, in the house, in society, and—in eternity at the tribunal of God. For the preacher, the teacher, and those who would improve the opportunities of self-training, these Briefs furnish fine material, unmixed with the preachy condescension or the cant and unreality so often found in books pretending to a like office as this well-printed volume.

Literary Chat.

The third volume of the new *Chambers' Cyclopœdia of English Literature* (Lippincott Company) has just appeared.

Within one month two new volumes are announced which first appeared as serials in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, viz., Dr. MacDonald's vindication of the *Apostolic Authorship of the Creed* (Christian Press Association, New York) and *Sick Calls*, by the Rev. Alfred Manning Mulligan, of Birmingham (Benziger Brothers).

We have already directed attention in a detailed review of the initial volumes to the monumental character of the Arthur Clark publication on the Philippine Islands. It is announced that the work will be complete in fifty-five volumes, covering the entire period of the Spanish possession—1493–1898—with a full analytical index and complete bibliography of Philippine literature.

Wilfred Meynell, who wrote his monographs on Pope Leo XIII, Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Manning, etc., under the pen-name of John Oldcastle, is about to issue a *Life of Lord Beaconsfield*. (Murray. London.) It appears thus almost simultaneously with the *Life of Gladstone* by John Morley. (The Macmillan Co.)

The Republic (Boston) published on October 3d a finely illustrated centennial number to commemorate the work accomplished for Christian citizenship through the agency of the Catholic Church in the Boston Diocese during the last hundred years. The names of Matignon, Cheverus, Fenwick, Fitzpatrick, and Williams form the principal links of that magnificent chain which binds together the results of a century's toils, sacrifices, and achievements in the cause of morality, education, and charity. Probably the most striking figure in the series of churchmen who directed the movement of Catholic progress in the Boston District is that of Bishop, later Cardinal, Cheverus, of whose beautiful monument at Bordeaux *The Republic* prints an excellent illustration which will be new to many readers. In this connection we may mention the probable publication at an early date of a number of letters of Cardinal Cheverus to his intimates. These remnants of valuable correspondents will show us something of the inner and familiar character of the great prelate who had a most affectionate disposition. The correspondence has come, we understand, into the possession of the American Catholic Historical Society (Philadelphia), and the arrangement of the letters has been entrusted to Miss I. M. O'Reilly, whose capable editorship of similar material in former issues of *The Historical Records* promises to place the treasures in a becoming setting.

The bibliography of Matthew Arnold's commentators is to be increased by a volume from the pen of W. H. Dawson (G. P. Putnam's Sons), who enters upon a study of the philosophy of "the Master of all English critics" during the last half century. The latest commentator, Professor Saintsbury, who also deals with this subject, leaves a very uncertain impression upon the reader as to Matthew Arnold's claim to literary fame or his merit as a critic; possibly that is an evidence of accuracy of judgment in the Edinburgh scholar.

Matthew Arnold suffered from an exaggerated vision of what he terms "the mischiefs of the Catholic system – its ultramontanism, sacerdotalism, superstition." This he shows in most of his politico-philosophical essays, and expressly in his *Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism*. But he appreciates the practical side of the Catholic religion and sees in it the real and lasting strength of its superiority over other religious systems. "I persist in thinking that Catholicism has, from this superiority, a great future before it, that it will endure while all the Protestant sects [in which he does not include the Church of England] dissolve and perish. I persist in thinking that the prevailing form of the Christianity of the future will be the form of Catholicism."

Professor Francis G. Peabody, of Harvard University, is about to add another volume to his admirable library of Christian culture. The new book, *The Religion of an Educated Man*, addresses itself to the youth at the secular college, and in appealing to him to render his life well ordered, useful, and contented, furnishes him with certain ethical principles drawn from an experience suggested by the doctrine of Christ. A Catholic who accepts with all its consequences the teaching of the Gospel, believing it to emanate directly from a divine source and carrying with it the sanction of the Godhead of Christ, may discover here and there a note which detracts from the reverence with which he regards the ancient apostolic tradition. On

this subject we have expressed our views in noticing former volumes from Dr. Peabody's pen. But this does not destroy the force of the author's plea for a high standard of personal and public morality to be attained by present means and under present circumstances.

Dr. Lawrence F. Flick, whose name is identified with numerous projects of charity successfully carried on and whose activity as former President of the Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia entitles him to the gratitude of all who rejoice in the promotion of Christian culture, has just published (David McKay) a neat volume entitled *Consumption a Curable and Preventable Disease*. It embodies in very readable form the wide experience of one whose views gained by careful study as a specialist are fully borne out by actual tests. Two noteworthy facts are brought to light by Dr. Flick's observations—first, that climate has, strictly speaking, no causative relation to consumption; secondly, that alcohol, instead of being, as is popularly assumed, a preventive of consumption, actually serves as a predisposing cause of it. There is abundance of excellent practical information in this altogether temperately written treatise on the subject that will be found profitable not only to the physician and the nurse, but also to the educator and indeed to all whose influence over others extends to their physical as well as moral well-being.

The Scribners have in press a volume by President Hadley, of Yale University, on the subject of Freedom and the Responsibilities of Democratic Government. One of the chapters is to deal with Civic Liberty and Religious Toleration. We have already, from Dr. Hadley's former volume entitled *The Education of the American Citizen*, a sufficiently clear enunciation of his conviction that, to make a government influential and strong, the education of the moral man is of paramount importance. "I believe," he writes, "that one of the most important applications of the idea of power training is found in its extension to the moral side of the education, to develop to his highest perfection the moral man is the one educational function of religion." It will be interesting to note how Professor Hadley regards this function as a factor of our public life.

Pennfield's *Present-day Egypt* is being published in a new edition by the Century Company.

Little, Brown & Company are publishing a useful book, *Food and Cookery for the Sick and Convalescent*, by Francis M. Farmer.

In THE DOLPHIN for December there begins a series of articles on Socialism by the Rev. Dr. W. J. Kerby, of the Catholic University of America, Washington. The papers will treat in successive numbers of the nature of Socialism; the plan, the method, and the spirit of Socialism; the different kinds of Socialism; the assumptions of Socialism; the relations of Socialism to the Church, State, Labor Unions, Anarchy, in both their theoretical and practical aspects; the strength of Socialism; the weakness of Socialism; the checking of Socialism; methods in Reform. Simultaneous with this series will be continued the articles in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW by the Rev. Dr. Stang, whose study of the subject and practical

experience as a missionary among the laboring classes of industrial centres, particularly in New England, entitle his views to exceptional consideration.

The leading students of Irish literature in New York have just formed a new society for the promotion of the study of the language, history, the drama, music and art of Ireland, with a view at the same time of creating a centre of social and literary intercourse for persons of Irish nationality. The Constitution and By-Laws have been issued (John Quinn, 120 Broadway), although the Society has not yet decided upon permanent quarters. Honorary and non-resident members are admitted by election.

Nutt (London) publishes a volume on Irish education, by Mr. Hugh O'Donnell, who denounces clerical control of the schools in Ireland, and appeals (as a Catholic! *sic*) to his countrymen to rise in a combined reform movement which will rid the country of the interference of priests in the financial administration of educational funds, since the clergy are utterly indifferent to the rights of the Catholic laity and think only of feeding themselves and strengthening their authority.

The well-known Celtic author, Father Dinneen, has edited (Irish League) the poems of Pierce Ferriter, one of the victims of Cromwellian inroads, a poet and a soldier who, though not an Irishman, fought and labored and died for the cause of Ireland to which he was attached with an ardent affection for the sake of its unfortunate, but lovable people. He was educated by the English Government in 1653 at Killarney. One of his best poetic compositions is said to be the elegy composed for the Knight of Kerry.

A Reverend correspondent from abroad, after remarking, among other things, that he has found the late numbers of the REVIEW "even more interesting and useful than usual," goes on to speak of the recent chapters on Pastoral Theology by "Arthur Waldon." "He is drawing me in some such way as Father Sheehan did in his *My New Curate*. The last (September) article is very opportune—both on the side of the angels and the babies. I wish he would follow it up with an article that we could put in the hands of the married on the sin of hindering conception. That is growing terribly common, and keeps so many out of the Church. Men may be brought to see the sin when it is on their part; but women, under the advice of the physician, or, because they do not want to have more children at the present, think it quite permissible to resort to improper methods to prevent conception. One told me she would never have become a Catholic if she had known that she could not use simple means for that end. I wish the REVIEW could speak out on this." We understand that "Arthur Waldon" is of the same mind as our correspondent, and that he is making overtures with the Editor in regard to a paper on this topic.

Mr. James Jeffrey Roche's coming book, *Sorrows of Sap'ed*, to be published by Harper & Brothers, is described as a problem novel of the East, a story of a man with a present, four presents, all vigorous ladies with active tongues, and all married to him.

Books Received.

THEOLOGY.

THEOLOGIAE PASTORALIS. Pars Tertia: De Poenitentiae Sacramento: Practicam Tractationem Complectens. Auctore Iosepho Alberti S. Theol. et Utr. Iuris Doctore, Canonico Theologo, Professore S. Theol. Dogm. et Moralis in Ven. Seminario Aquipendiensi, etc. Romae, ex Officina Typographica Artificum A. S. Ioseph, Via S. Prisca N. 8. 9. (Aventino.) 1903. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. Pp. 136. Price, $0.80 *net*.

DE MULIERIBUS EXCISAE IMPOTENTIA ad Matrimonium. Ios. Antonelli Sac. Libraria Pontificia Frederici Pustet. Romae, Ratisbonae, Neo-Eboraci. 1903. New York and Cincinnati: Fa. Pustet & Co. Pp. 169 Price, $0.90 *net*.

WAS ST. PETER MARRIED? By the Rev. Joseph F. Sheahan. New York City: The Cathedral Library Association, 534 Amsterdam Avenue. 1903. Pp. 30.

THE HOLY SEE AND THE ORIENTAL CHURCH. Decisions which exhibit the Relations existing between the Holy See and the Oriental Church. Pp. 47.

BABYLON UND CHRISTENTUM. Von Franz Xavier Kugler, S.J. Erstes Heft. Delitzschs Angriffe auf das Alte Testament. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung. Zweigniederlassungen in Wien, Strassburg, München und St. Louis, Mo. 1903. Pp. iv—67. Price, $0.27 *net*.

NOMENCLATOR LITERARIUS Theologiae Catholicae, Theologos exhibens Aetate, Natione, Disciplinis distinctos. Tomus I. Edidit et Commentariis auxit H. Hurter, S.J., S. Theol. et Philos. Doctor, ejusdem S. Theolog. in C. R. Universitate Oenipontana Professor P. O. Cum Approbatione Celsissimi et Reverendissimi Episcopi Brixinensis et Facultate Superiorum. Editio tertia, emendata et aucta. Oeniponte. Libraria Academica Wagneriana. 1903. Pp. xvi—1099—lxx. Pretium, 12 *mark*.

LA SAINTE BIBLE POLYGLOTTE. Par F. Vigouroux. Ancien Testament. Tome IV. Les Psaumes—Les Proverbes—L'Ecclesiaste—Le Cantique des Cantiques—La Sagesse. Paris: A. Roger et F. Chernoviz. (Montreal: Libraire Granger.). 1903. Pp. 656.

SICK CALLS; or, Chapters of Pastoral Medicine. By the Rev. Alfred Manning Mulligan, Birmingham, England. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. 173.

GESCHICHTE DER ALTKIRCHLICHEN LITERATUR. Von Otto Bardenhewer, Doktor der Theologie und der Philosophie, Professor der Theologie an der Universität München. Zweiter Band. Vom Ende des zweiten Jahrhunderts bis zum Beginn des vierten Jahrhunderts. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung. Zweigniederlassungen in Wien, Strassburg, München und St. Louis, Mo. 1903. Pp. xvi—655.

BACK TO ROME. Being a Series of Private Letters, etc., addressed to an Anglican Clergyman. By Scrutator. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. (London: Sands & Co.) 1903. Pp. 224.

ASCETICA.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. Apparitions, Revelations, Graces. By Bernard St. John. London: Burns & Oates, Limited; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Pp. xv—486.

A SHORT LIFE OF THE VENERABLE MOTHER JEANNE ANTIDE THOURET. Foundress of the Sisters of Charity. Adapted (with Additions) from the Italian, by Blanche Anderdon (Whyte Avis). With a Preface by a Father of the Roman Province, S.J. London: Burns & Oates, Limited; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago; Benziger Brothers. (All rights reserved.) Pp. xiii—148.

A SPIRITUAL CONSOLATION and other Treatises. By the Blessed Martyr John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester. Edited by D. O'Connor. London: Art and Book Company; St. Louis: B. Herder. 1903. Pp. 114. Price, $0.30.

THE FOUR LAST THINGS. By the Blessed Martyr St. Thomas More, Kt. Edited by D. O'Connor. London: Art and Book Company; St. Louis: B. Herder. 1903. Pp. 102. Price, $0.30.

LITURGICAL NOTES ON THE MASS. By Charles Cowley Clarke, Priest, St. Mary Magdalene's, Brighton. Brighton: Henry J. Smith. 1903.

ST. JOSEPH'S ADVOCATE. Taken from Authentic Sources. Specially designed to aid in propagating among Youth increased Devotion to St. Joseph. Compiled by a Religious. Published with the Approbation of the Most Rev. John M. Farley, D.D., Archbishop of New York. New York: P. J. Kenedy. 1903. Pp. 355.

A PRECURSOR OF ST. PHILIP. (Buonsignore Cacciaguerra.) By Lady Amabel Kerr. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1903. P. 196. Price, $1.25.

EDUCATIONAL.

LIGHT FOR NEW TIMES. A Book for Catholic girls. By Margaret Fletcher, with a Preface by W. D. Strappini, S.J. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. xiii—81.

DOUBTS ABOUT DARWINISM. By a Semi-Darwinian. London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co. 1903. Pp. vi—115.

THE YOUNG WOMAN IN MODERN LIFE. By Beverley Warner, D.D., author of *The Young Man in Modern Life*, *English History in Shakespeare's Plays*, etc. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. 1903. Pp. viii—218. Price, $0.85.

NAUTICAL DISTANCES AND HOW TO COMPUTE THEM. For the use of Schools. By the Right Rev. John J. Hogan. Pp. 48. Price, $0.50.

THE HOLY FAMILY SERIES OF CATECHISMS. No. 3. For the use of the Christian Doctrine Advanced Class. The Catechism prepared and enjoined by the order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, completely rearranged, simplified, and supplemented by the Rev. Francis Butler, Priest of the Archdiocese of Boston. With *Holy Family Hymn Book*. Boston: Thomas J. Flynn & Co. 1903. Pp. 383—62.

DRESDEN'S GERMAN COMPOSITION. By B. Mark Dresden, A.M., Instructor in German, State Normal School, Oshkosh, Wis. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: American Book Company. 1903. Pp. 68. Price, $0.40.

DILLARD'S AUS DEM DEUTSCHEN DICHTERWALD. Favorite German Poems. Edited by J. H. Dillard, Professor in Tulane University of Louisiana. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: American Book Company. 1903. Pp. 206. Price, $0.60.

SHAKESPEARE'S MERCHANT OF VENICE. Revised Edition. Edited with notes by William J. Rolfe, Litt.D., formerly Head Master of the High School, Cambridge, Mass. Pp. 236. Price, $0.56.

THE BALDWIN SPELLER. By S. R. Shear, Superintendent of Schools, Kingston, N. Y., assisted by Margaret T. Lynch, Principal of Public School No. 2, White Plains, N. Y. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: American Book Company. 1903. Pp. 128. Price, $0.20.

PEARSON'S LATIN PROSE COMPOSITION. By Henry Carr Pearson, A.B. (Harvard), Horace Mann School, Teachers' College, New York. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: American Book Company. 1903. Pp. 259. Price, $1.00.

COLEMAN'S PHYSICAL LABORATORY MANUAL. By S. E. Coleman, Head of the Science Department, Oakland, Cal., High School. Illustrations. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: American Book Company. 1903. Pp. 234. Price, $0.60.

ELEMENTS OF SOLID GEOMETRY. Cloth, 12mo, pp. 137. Price, $0.75.

ELEMENTS OF PLANE AND SOLID GEOMETRY. By Alan Sanders, Hughes High School, Cincinnati, Ohio. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: American Book Company. 1903. Pp. 384. Price, $1.25.